THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 5, 6 & 7. AUG., SEPT., OCT., 1933. Vol. XXIII.

THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN

By the Editor.

We publish in this number of the *Modern Churchman* all the papers read at the Twentieth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen held at Girton College, Cambridge, August 21st to 26th, 1933. The subject of the Conference papers and discussions was *The Christian Church and the Modern World.* Although of enormous range, the subject was restricted in some measure by being considered from the point of view of English Churchmen of the Modernist School. The Presidential Address by the Dean of St. Paul's dealt with *The Church of the New Testament.* It was followed by thirteen papers:

(1) *The Christian Church as a Divine Fellowship*, by Dr. Samuel McComb.

(2) *Creative Worship*, by Canon Harold Anson.

(3) *The Authority of the Christian Church; its Basis and Justification*, by the Rev. Chancellor Bezzant.

(4) *The Authority of the Christian Church in Doctrine*, by the Rev. Professor Creed.

(5) *The Authority of the Christian Church in Ethics*, by the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, M.A.

(6) *The Authority of the Christian Church in Economic, Industrial and Political Problems*, by the Rev. M. T. Dunlop.

(7) *The Christian Church and Education in the Day Schools*, by Mr. M. V. C. Jeffreys, M.A.

(8) *The Christian Church and Education in the Public Schools*, by the Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A., B.D.

(9) *The Christian Church and Education in the Parish*, by the Rev. J. P. Hodges, M.A.

(10) *The Character and Call of the Church of England in relation to Roman Catholicism*, by the Rev. Dr. Longford.

(12) *In relation to Modernism*, by the Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

(13) *In relation to the State*, by the Rev. Professor Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil.

The discussions on these papers were useful and interesting. Besides the general discussions, however, there were also the contributions of select speakers. Prominent among these were Sir Francis Fremantle, M.P., and Sir Arnold Wilson, M.P., on the relations of Church and State. Sir Francis Fremantle spoke sympathetically of the tone and temper of the Church Assembly, and pleaded that a lay member must needs be ecclesiastically minded, just as a member of the House of Commons must become politically minded, if he is to be an efficient M.P.

We are convinced that the efficient M.P. has to be in constant contact with the national mind, rather than with the House of Commons mind, or his own party-machine mind, if he is to be really effective in the highest degree. Consequently we should hold that the lay member of the Church Assembly, if he is to perform the real functions of a lay member, must be more in sympathy with English lay feeling, especially the outlook and temper of the increasing number of laymen, who are moving further and further away from ecclesiastical sympathies and loyalties, than with that select body who are so adequately represented, and indeed over-represented, in the Church Assembly at present. It is 'them that are without,' and the problem of how to attract and convince them, with which the Church ought to

be concerned primarily, rather than with ministering to that decreasing number of the laity who are satisfied with traditional teaching and traditional methods.

The high tribute which Sir Arnold Wilson paid to the energy and influence of the rural clergy was welcomed by those who know how difficult their lot is, and how conspicuously influential for good they are in their communities. The Church of England is still the Church of rural England, although it is ceasing to be the Church of industrial and commercial England.

Dr. Shipler, the Editor of the oldest Church paper in the United States—*The Churchman* of New York, founded in 1804—and Dr. Cummins, the Editor of *The Chronicle*, another well-known New England Church newspaper, contributed eloquent speeches.

Dr. Shipler spoke with characteristic combination of humour and seriousness on the Church in relation to economic and industrial problems, and Dr. Cummins dealt in a most practical fashion with the organization and work of Sunday Schools, and the need for close co-operation and united effort among all the Reform Churches in each locality. Dr. Noordhoff, from Holland, a representative of a vast and growing Liberal Christian organization on the Continent, addressed the Conference on the work of his society, and announced the holding of an International Congress next year, probably in Prague, at which he hoped representatives of English Modernism would be present.

The Conference was much indebted to the visit of Dr. Martin Shaw, the musical editor of the increasingly popular hymn-book, *Songs of Praise*, who conducted a stimulating and highly instructive practice in community hymn-singing.

Much larger congregations attended daily Evensong in Chapel than has been the custom in recent years. This we attribute to the attractive power of our select preachers, the Rev. T. F. Royds (Chaplain), Dr. Bouquet, the Rev. A. E. N. Hitchcock, the Rev. F. G. Given-Wilson, and the Rev. W. L. MacKennal, who delivered admirable addresses, which we regret greatly we cannot find space to publish in this issue.

The Conference owed much to its Chairmen, particularly to Dr. Douglas White and Professor F. C. Burkitt. It was a great pleasure to all to visit Girton College once more and to have the

pleasant surprise of meeting Miss Leveson again, who came back especially to act as Bursar during our visit. Everything that could be done, it was felt, was done by the College authorities to minister to the comfort and convenience of Conference members. 'We were the recipients not only of covenanted but also of uncovenanted mercies.'

The Press reports of the Conference proceedings, especially in *The Times* and *Guardian*, were competent and well-informed. In some less well-known papers, however, the Press reports were so misleading and irresponsible, as to lead some to doubt whether it would not be in the interests of the Conference if the Press were excluded. Religious bias, and a desire to enliven the holiday season by sensationalism and jocularity, were no doubt the cause of this misuse of the Press.

> 'The Drama's laws, the Drama's patrons give,
> For they who live to please, must please to live'

is as true of pressmen as of actors. Yet publicity, even though it take the form of misrepresentation and caricature, is not without its advantages. The public is often more discerning in these matters than the Press gives it credit for. Since the War, the public takes Press reports at a much lower valuation; Press facts receive attention, Press comments are largely ignored. It is considerations such as these which make it undesirable to exclude the Press from any part of the Conference proceedings.

The *Church Times* seized the opportunity to publish in its issue of August 25th a leading article entitled 'The Futility of Modernism,' in which it commented adversely on Modernist aims and methods, particularly as exemplified by the proceedings of the Conference. We can hardly expect the *Church Times* at this stage in its evolution to be sympathetic towards Modernism, but we should be glad if it could show a somewhat larger measure of understanding in regard to Modernist ideals. To assert that orthodoxy is almost a term of abuse among Modernists is to misrepresent the tone and temper of responsible Modernist leaders. The Conference papers published in this number provide no justification for such a charge. A fundamental difference between the Traditionalist and the Modernist is that, whereas the Traditionalist views orthodoxy as static, the Modernist is convinced that it is subject to evolution. 'The

Faith once for all delivered to the Saints' the Traditionalist appears to regard as an unchanging and unchangeable formulary, whereas the Modernist regards the Faith as a conviction, a principle, and an attitude capable of infinite development and expansion, and in need of constant reformulation in accordance with the growing experience of the Christian Church and the ever-increasing knowledge of the Universe which we owe to Science. The Modernist feels it to be his duty to stress this need for reformulation and to attempt its achievement. The *Church Times* condemned Modernists for using old theological terms with a new meaning. But if continuity of Christian thought and teaching is to be secured, we regard this method as a necessity. Of course, in the task of reformulation the new meaning attached to the old term should not go so far as to deny or negative the old idea which the term signified, but to adjust that old idea to new knowledge and new ways of thinking. Christian experience is a growing experience, and Catholic theology a growing theology. When the *Church Times* speaks airily of the 'futility of Modernism,' it is not amiss to remind our contemporary that Modernism, in its influence, is by no means limited to those who profess themselves Modernists, or are labelled Modernists by their ecclesiastical opponents. Modernism is steadily penetrating both Anglo-Catholicism and Evangelicalism in the person of their leaders. Evidence for this penetration abounds on every hand. But the fact of this penetration is not less significant than the strength and authority which this Modernist infusion is giving to these schools of English Churchmanship to-day. Bishop Gore was perhaps the greatest Modernist of the age which closed with his death.

Justice requires us, however, to note one important concession made in the *Church Times* leader :

> 'We should welcome such a re-statement of the old Gospel as would commend it to what is serious in the modern mind.'

This expresses admirably the aim of the English Modernist, and we could wish that the *Church Times*, besides being ready to welcome, would also do its best to assist in the achievement of this aim.

When the *Church Times* naïvely asks :

> 'What would religion be like in England, if the leadership of the clergy with all their sacerdotal pretensions were withdrawn?'

it asks a question most Englishmen have no difficulty in answering. In their view the English Church would be vastly more influential for good if it dropped all priestly pretensions. Moral and spiritual leadership is not dependent on priestly pretensions in the modern world : the leadership of the clergy depends upon their qualifications to lead, and those qualifications are personal, educational, social, moral and spiritual. The English Church stands on the character and conduct, not on the sacerdotal pretensions, of the English clergy, and sacerdotal pretensions in a modern educated society, militate against rather than assist moral and spiritual influence. Our great nineteenth century sacerdotalists in England have prevailed in spite of their sacerdotal pretensions, not on account of them.

The *Universe* (which in the Roman Catholic English-speaking world occupies very much the same position as does the *Church Times* in the Anglican Communion) also published a leading article in its issue of September 1st condemning the proceedings of English Modernists as exemplified in their recent Conference 'at Oxford' (*sic*). The leader, which began by stating :

> 'We ourselves purposely made no reference to the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Oxford in our last issue, because its proceedings are of no interest to Catholics, and of so little interest to the general public, that Catholics do not need to trouble about its repercussions,'

yet seemed to find it necessary to devote two columns to criticism and condemnation of the Conference proceedings.

The *Universe* took strong exception to the criticism of Romanist propaganda contained in Dr. Longford's paper. Catholic *cultus* as practised in the Roman Church, we have no desire to criticize or condemn. At the bar of New Testament teaching, such *cultus* may seem to us to be sub-Christian, but when we observe the simple and self-sacrificing lives which have been developed by its devotion and discipline, we feel that unless Romanism be engaged in active propaganda among English Church people, Christian charity requires us to be silent. But, unhappily, Roman Catholic piety seems invariably to be associated with Roman Catholic propaganda, and in that propagandist campaign piety is exploited by Papal policy. In this country, propagandist Romanism becomes not only an insolent and aggressive faction, but is essentially intolerant, and

is bent on securing the disintegration and destruction of our National Church. We Modernists desire religious freedom and religious tolerance, but how, in the interests of this ideal, we ought to treat an active organization in our midst which is the enemy of religious freedom and religious tolerance, is the problem. Religious controversy is the worst kind of controversy. Shall we 'basely through silence allow things to pass away as in a dream,' or ought we to oppose this propaganda by drawing public attention to its character and consequences? Many of us have Roman Catholic friends and even Roman Catholic relations, whom we respect and like and would be unwilling to wound, but the system, and the methods of the system to which they adhere, necessitate, in the interests of human progress and our national welfare, that Roman propaganda should be criticized and checked. Such criticism should of course be just, and differentiate between the system and the individuals who support it, but we are convinced that it may not be dispensed with at the present time. Roman Catholicism in England, particularly in the form of the Irish Roman Catholic immigrant, is becoming an economic and political danger to Great Britain. How to deal with this menace is for our statesmen a more serious problem than is Roman Catholic propaganda for the believer in religious freedom.

It is considerations such as these which justify the publication of Dr. Longford's Conference paper, to which the *Universe* takes such strong exception, but 'facts are chiels that winna ding.' They have got to be faced both by our State and Church.

The general attack made by the *Universe* on Modernism proceeded to condemn English Modernists generally, on such charges as the following:

> 'They (Modernists) simply take for granted that the human reason, the human person, is what matters, and that revelation and God have to be squared with these, or it will be all the worse for the latter.'

Joseph Butler, one of our greatest English theologians, who in the eyes of many, and they not simply English Churchmen, has more right to be heard than Pius X, wrote these words nearly two hundred years ago:

> 'Reason is the candle of the Lord within us, and that by which we must judge even of Revelation itself.'

This also is the conviction of English Modernists. Of course,

Butler used the term 'reason' to include both the rational and moral consciousness, and it is impossible for anyone who believes in reason as the candle of the Lord within him, to accept as a Divine revelation what conflicts with the affirmations of that reason. Modernists would admit that Divine Revelation may be super-rational, but if it were irrational they could not receive it as Divine Revelation. Professor Burkitt spoke of the change which is coming over the religious thinking of young men to-day, when he remarked that in the mind of the modern student of religion in Cambridge University, Dogmatic Theology was that which had been believed, but Philosophy of Religion was that which had to be believed or ought to be believed. Divine Revelation comes to man through men, although its *fons et origo* is the Divine Source of the universe itself. But that which claims to be a Divine Revelation must, as a condition of full acceptance, be tested concurrently by man's rational, moral and spiritual consciousness. This does not mean that the individual, in judging, will ignore the judgment of his fellow-Christians, nor of the Christian Church of the past, but that he will feel that his judgment must, in the last resort, be his own. He will also recognize that the rational, moral and spiritual consciousness is capable of development, and that, as a consequence, the judgments of the past are not necessarily authoritative for the present or for the future. Of course, the *Universe* may parody such a statement by describing it as

> 'making Divine Revelation square with human reason.'

But he who believes that reason is the candle of the Lord within us, will expect to find no ultimate conflict, but profound agreement between the voice of God within and the voice of God without. When the *Universe* adds:

> 'this Modernism is sheer worldliness in its beginnings, in its course, and in its outcome,'

it is not surprising that this should be the verdict of an absolutist ecclesiasticism, whose claims to infallibility and supernatural authority are not recognized by Modernists as justified, either at the bar of Scripture, or History, or personal Christian experience.

THE CHURCH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By the Very Reverend the Dean of St. Paul's, K.C.V.O., D.D.

PROFESSOR Gwatkin at the beginning of his *Early Church History* brings a grave indictment against the Anglican Church historians since the Oxford Movement. 'Church history,' he says, 'has not always had a bad name in England. It was as respectable as any other till it was covered with reproach by the partisanship and credulity of the Tractarians. Whatever service they did by calling attention to the subject was far outweighed by the scandal of their uncritical methods and unhistorical dogmas. The reproach is not yet done away, for the literature with which the successors of that school have flooded the country is little better than a dream. Its writers often have their merit; but their fundamental dogmas compel them systematically to set aside the plainest facts of history.'

We may regretfully admit that this indictment is partially justified, without attributing anything like bad faith to Anglo-Catholic historians. They start with certain presuppositions about the nature and origin of the Church, and they naturally wish to put back the beginnings of Catholicism as far as possible, so as to obtain the authority of Christ and the Apostles for the later developments which made the Church what it subsequently became. 'Catholicism is as old as Christianity'; this is the thesis which they wish to establish.

Well, of course Catholicism is as old as Christianity, and much older too. It is as old as Paganism. Ovid accuses the Greeks of inventing the *ex opere operato* theory of sacramental grace:

> Graecia principium moris fuit; illa nocentes
> Impia lustratos ponere facta putat.
> A, nimium faciles, qui tristia crimina caedis
> Fluminea tolli posse putatis aqua.

He might have gone still further back than Greece, for the natural man is a Catholic, whether he is civilized or savage. I have a respect for the natural man. We are all natural men. But it does

not follow that either denominational exclusiveness or sacerdotal magic can be found in the New Testament.

But no doubt Anglo-Catholic historians had their case. The German Protestant theory that Catholicism is just a corruption of primitive Protestantism is also unhistorical. In the duel between Harnack and Loisy, the Frenchman did not get the worst of it. Loisy, however, was too acute to argue that full-fledged Catholicism can be found even in germ in the Gospels. His argument is that since Christ presumably meant His Church to survive, and since it could survive only by adapting itself to human needs, the later developments of Catholicism, which have proved their survival value, must be assumed to be in accordance with the intentions of the Founder. This argument does not require so much distortion of early Church history as the high Anglican theory.

In this paper I shall try to state the facts as fairly as I can. It is of course far too large a subject for one address.

The Teutonic word 'church' is probably derived from *κυριακόν*, 'the Lord's house.' We can hardly suppose that any Christian community called themselves by a name which signifies a building. Perhaps the Goths discovered that the Christian temples which they burnt were called something like 'churches,' and so they picked up the name. But in this paper I shall assume that Church means *Ecclesia*. Ecclesia means an assembly of the people, which is also the meaning of synagogue. The two were for a time almost interchangeable, and in the Epistle of James 'synagogue' is used of a meeting for Christian worship. 'If a man shall come into your synagogue . . .' In Palestine the same Aramaic word was probably used for both. One reason why the Christians preferred Ecclesia may have been that it suggested the *ἐκκλητοί* or *ἐκλεκτοί*, 'the elect,' as they called themselves.

The saying 'Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia' is justified by the words of Christ, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' Every meeting of Christians, however small, was a meeting of the Church, the Body of which Christ was the Head.

But before discussing the beginnings of the Church in the apostolic age, we must try to answer the question whether and in

what sense Christ can be said to have founded a Church during His earthly ministry.

After the captivity the Jewish State almost transformed itself into a Church. The Maccabean princes were heads of a priest-state, a type of which there were other examples in the Near East. The bond which united the Jews was now religious rather than national; and under the influence of the prophets a conception of God was taking root which was incompatible with the older nationalism. Our Lord Himself thought of God as the noblest of the prophets did; but His teaching was far more detached from political aspirations than that of the Jerusalem Church. It was indeed more detached than the Palestinian Christian Church. St. Paul understood the implications of the Gospel message far better than James, the Lord's brother.

The objections to the belief that Christ founded a Church may be stated under three heads. (1) There is no record of any such foundation or intention. (2) It is inconceivable, when we remember His loyalty to the institutional Church of Judaism, that He contemplated setting up a rival religion and a rival hierarchy. (3) He at any rate allowed His disciples to think that 'the Kingdom of God,' in a miraculous sense, was close at hand.

The first objection is less decisive if we accept everything in St. Matthew's Gospel as authentic. St. Matthew is obviously a proto-Catholic. He is the only evangelist to mention the word Ecclesia; and if we had this Gospel only we might almost believe that Christ founded a society containing 'bad and good,' and governed by its own officers. But it is not easy to believe that the words 'Tell it to the Ecclesia' were ever spoken by our Lord.

As for the second, the little flock most certainly did not break openly with Judaism until they were expelled. After the Ascension they lived as strict and pious Jews, obeying the Law, and distinguished from the mass of the Jewish community mainly by their belief that the expected Messiah was none other than their Master returning in glory. They seem to have had no synagogue of their own. They knew no other Church but the Jewish. In the persecution which arose about Stephen — a persecution of Modernists, as we should call them — the apostles were left un-

molested. This is, I think, decisive against the theory that anything at all resembling a rival cult, openly separate from Judaism, was ever thought of during the ministry of Christ.

With regard to the third, the so-called eschatological theory associated with the name of Schweitzer, I need not repeat the arguments against it which I have more than once urged in these conferences, especially as in its extreme form the theory seems to be almost dead. There is no doubt that the disciples did believe that 'the time is short,' and that in consequence they never dwelt on the thought that the life of the Church might extend, without any miraculous cataclysm, for centuries or millennia. Thoughts of the distant future were, even without this erroneous belief, foreign to the ideas of the first century. But the whole tenor of the Gospel preaching, sane, temperate and ethical through and through, is incompatible with the notion that either enthusiastic apocalyptism or inert quietism was the foundation of the Galilean ministry. If the words are genuine, that the Gospel must first be preached to all nations, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that the apocalyptic passages have been coloured by the expectations which we know to have been entertained at the time, and not by the disciples of Christ only.

Our conclusion, I think, must be that though Christ in His lifetime made no open breach with the Jewish Church, and never attempted anything like a rival organization, His teaching led inevitably and logically to such a breach and to such an organization, unless indeed the Jews were willing to accept a fulfilment of their religious and national aspirations almost cruelly unlike what they pictured to themselves.

Our Lord's creation was not the Church, but the company of the Apostles, who were at first called the Twelve, the number being doubtless suggested by the Twelve Tribes of Israel. When the treachery of Judas made a gap in their number, another Apostle was chosen from among those who had companied with Jesus while He was on earth and were witnesses of His resurrection.

The Apostles felt themselves to be ambassadors for Christ. They were missionaries pure and simple, with no other calling. It was believed that as Apostles they had miraculous powers, and the promise of Christ was quoted that in the Kingdom they

should sit upon twelve thrones, judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel—an indication, by the way, that no mission to the Gentiles was as yet thought of. They incarnated *tradition*. No sayings of their own are reported; their calling was to be witnesses to Christ. They preached repentance, the fact of the Resurrection, and the fulfilment of Jewish prophecies in Christ. They probably had but little sympathy with the Hellenistic presentation of the Gospel propounded by Stephen and his friends, and they made few Gentile converts. No progress was possible on these lines.

By the side of the Twelve stood the family of Jesus, who had not believed in Him while He was alive. In spite of this, their kinship with the Founder gave them a great position, and there was even a possibility that a kind of Khalifate might have been established in the family of Joseph and Mary. They became a reactionary element in the Palestinian Church.

Next to the Apostles—and we must remember that many others besides the Twelve were allowed the title of Apostle, *e.g.* Barnabas and Silas, as the New Testament shows—in dignity and importance came the Prophets. Contrary to what used to be taught, the prophets in Palestine had never wholly disappeared. The Hebrew word for prophet probably means 'speaker.' The prophet was an announcer and interpreter of the secret purposes of God, just as the Greek προφήτης was originally an interpreter of an oracle. They were not philosophers or theologians. Although it is often said that the prophet is primarily a forthteller, not a foreteller, the power of predicting the future was part of a prophet's commission, in primitive Christianity as well as in Judaism. In the enthusiastic period immediately after Pentecost there was a great outpouring of the spirit of prophecy. Men and women 'spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance.' But it became necessary to distinguish between prophetic utterances and the scarcely intelligible 'speaking with tongues,' which St. Paul was half inclined to discourage, though it was believed that the incoherent babblings of the excited speaker were either some unknown human tongue or the speech of the angels. The prophets in the apostolic age were the stormy petrels of the new community. They were subordinate to the apostles, but very important. Their office was purely charismatic.

The 'Teachers,' also mentioned by St. Paul as holding a recognized position in the community, may have been men who studied the intellectual presentation of Christianity and tried to commend it to educated persons. Among such men was Apollos; and no doubt the foundation of a Christian gnosis was their work.

'Evangelists' and 'Pastors' are also mentioned. The former may have been itinerant missionaries who had not received the status of Apostles; the latter local ministers. The local ministry, as distinguished from the itinerant, comprised bishops or overseers (ἐπίσκοποι), presbyters and deacons. Their functions were partly administrative, partly pastoral. They, and not the apostles, usually performed baptisms. As for the bishops, in the New Testament the title is only applied to officials at Philippi and Ephesus, and (in the *Epistle to Titus*) in Crete. It is considered to be proved that bishops and presbyters were the same in the apostolic age; even in Clement of Rome this seems certain. Hort however thinks that the words 'bishop' and 'deacon' in the New Testament are used in a non-technical sense — 'those who supervise' and 'those who minister'; but it seems to me more likely that the titles of functions were already fixed. The word 'presbyter,' or 'elder,' was familiar both to the Palestinian Jews and to the pagans. For example, it was in use in Egypt.

But there is a real problem about episcopacy. If this means monarchical government of a diocese by a single bishop, as opposed to joint supervision by several presbyter-bishops, there is hardly a trace of such a thing in the New Testament. But less than a hundred years later it is universal, and not only so, but Irenaeus can speak of episcopacy as 'the ancient custom of the Church.' Did the Twelve Apostles give orders that every Church should have its bishop? Irenaeus believed in a divine sanction for episcopacy. He and Hegesippus give lists of bishops in order of succession. They call James bishop of Jerusalem, and Timothy of Ephesus. But do we, in point of fact, find bishops everywhere at the time, say, of Clement of Rome? Clement makes it clear that there was no bishop at Corinth, and Corinth was an important Church. Polycarp, who was certainly bishop of Smyrna, bids the Church of God at Philippi to 'submit themselves to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ.' Nor does Clement call himself bishop of Rome; Ignatius says no-

thing about the bishop when he is writing to Rome, nor does Hermas. Many think that Rome had no bishop at this time.

Ignatius furnishes the strongest evidence that episcopacy was already regarded as of divine origin at a very early date. No words can be stronger than those which he uses about the duty of obedience to a bishop. 'We ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself. He that honours the bishop is honoured by God. All who are of God and Jesus Christ are with the bishop. It is not lawful to baptize or to hold a love-feast without the bishop. The Spirit proclaimed, Do nothing without the bishop'; and so on. But he does not say, 'as the apostles commanded.'

There is really no reason to think that the Twelve, or their successors, gave any such command. The development of the monarchical episcopate was in accordance with the general trend of the age towards one-man government. The episcopate was not a continuation of the office of the apostles; it was developed out of the presbyterate. In some places, and ultimately in all, the system of monarchical rule established itself without much opposition. Ignatius is not fulminating against presbyterians, but against separatists.

The word priest (*ἱερεύς*) is never used in the New Testament of the Christian ministry, and this is certainly no accident. Christians as a body are called 'priests' and 'a priesthood' in *I Peter* and the Apocalypse, and in *Hebrews* Christ is called 'high-priest.' I do not think there is any clear instance of sacerdotal language about the Christian ministry before Tertullian, who calls a bishop 'summus sacerdos.' In Cyprian the innovation is of course complete.

The Christians in the Gospels are called 'disciples' (*μαθηταί*); in St. Paul the favourite names are 'brethren' or 'saints.' The Church was spoken of as a 'fellowship' (*κοινωνία*). The name Christians' was a nickname, and points to a recognized separation between the 'disciples' and the other Jews. The 'brethren' at first held secret meetings in one another's houses. They did not break off from the Jewish Church; they were driven out of it. The preaching of Stephen and others no doubt opened the eyes of the hierarchy to the really revolutionary implications of the new teaching.

But it was the cult of the 'Lord Christ' which really created the Church. Common worship on the first day of the week began very early, and the common meal, which was probably distinct from the Sunday service. The bond was at first *enthusiasm*, which showed itself in all the familiar phenomena of revivalism. The descriptions of these excited gatherings are valuable evidence for the psychological condition of the early converts. But such revivals never last long, and when the excitement cools, a more orderly form of worship, under due regulation, becomes necessary. Already in St. Paul we see the uneasiness of the apostle at the undignified proceedings which he had witnessed or heard of at Corinth. Catholicism was the inevitable heir of the charismatic ministry of the first century. Before long, the disciples of Christ began to fast, like the disciples of John the Baptist and of the Pharisees; and they were not afraid to interpolate the text of the Gospels, in order to obtain a divine sanction for putting fasting on the same level as prayer.

The question how far St. Paul was willing to go in the direction of ecclesiasticism depends very much on whether the Pastoral Epistles are genuine. These letters clearly imply a development of Church government which cannot be found in his other Epistles. The qualifications of a bishop and a deacon are enumerated, and the clergy are commissioned to 'exhort' and 'rebuke.' The balance of critical opinion is in favour of the view that the letters to Timothy and Titus are not genuine, or, as some think, that they are partly genuine and partly not. I am not much in favour of this last theory; but I can see that there are real difficulties in rejecting the Pauline authorship. The objections to accepting them as St. Paul's would be much lessened if we believed that St. Paul was not executed at the end of his two years' imprisonment at Rome. This seems to me probable. I do not know of any law under which St. Paul, a Roman citizen, could have been put to death. He was accused by fanatics at Jerusalem, a class who would not carry much weight at Rome. A prosecution at Rome by provincials was a costly affair, and generally failed, so that it was seldom attempted. As Juvenal says, 'furor est post omnia perdere naulum.' If then St. Paul was released at the end of two years, because his accusers failed to put in an appearance, and if he resumed his missionary

labours, visiting Spain, as he intended to do, it is possible that before his death he may have seen and acquiesced in a further stage towards a hierarchical government of the Church. But I do not think we can build much on this possibility.

A vast amount of literature exists about the Sacraments in the New Testament; unfortunately most of it is biassed on one side or the other. Curiously enough, among the extreme supporters of the view that St. Paul held and inculcated crudely superstitious or magical views of the efficacy of sacraments are some who have no sympathy with Catholicism. Professor Lake is an example. Controversy has raged as to whether, and to what extent, Pauline Christianity was influenced by the pagan mystery-cults. It is certain that his later epistles are steeped in the technical phraseology of the mysteries, and that the Christ-mysticism which was the kernel of his personal faith belonged to the same type of religion as the higher developments of Orphism. On the other hand, the parallels with Mithra worship should not be stressed, for Mithra became popular only after the first century, and then, it would seem, specially in the Roman army. On the whole, it does not seem likely that St. Paul borrowed anything essential from these rites. He was a Jew, and neither he nor the Church after him would make any concessions to the tolerant *theocrasia* which made it easy for a pious pagan to be initiated into several mysteries. Still, the whole conception of sacraments was Greek rather than Jewish. If Christ can be said to have instituted the two great sacraments, He never sanctioned or thought of some of the later Catholic doctrines about them.

The sacramentalism in St. Paul's Epistles has been greatly exaggerated. As Kennedy says, the background and atmosphere of the Pauline conceptions of death and resurrection with Christ are incongruous with the mystery-ritual. Even if the repulsive ceremony of the taurobolium could be traced back to our period, and it cannot, what could be more unlike the *renatus in aeternum taurobolio* than St. Paul's words about the death unto sin and the new birth unto righteousness? The apostle was singularly detached from ritual in every shape and form. It is 'the word of the Cross' which is 'the power of God to those who are being saved,' not the sacrament of baptism, of which he speaks with no

great reverence. 'Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.' The curious statement that 'all were baptized into Moses' tells against any magical significance in baptism, for no mystical relationship between the Hebrews and Moses was established by their adventures under his leadership. In the Epistle to the Romans, doctrinally perhaps the most important of all, he mentions baptism once only, and the Lord's Supper not at all. When in I *Corinthians* he says that 'by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, and were all made to drink of one Spirit,' it is the *social* significance of the Sacraments on which he wishes to insist, not their miraculous efficacy. The supreme importance which he again and again ascribes to Faith is decisive against the notion that he attributed an *ex opere operato* power to the Sacraments. In *Ephesians* the writer (St. Paul or another) speaks of Christ as 'having purified the Church by the bath of water with the word,' but the baptism of the Ecclesia can hardly be taken literally.

In speaking of the Eucharist, Heitmüller and others actually refer to the savage notion of 'eating a God.' This idea could not rightly be applied to the Greek mysteries, and to ascribe it to a Jew is monstrous. It is true that Porphyry, very much later, accuses the Christians of the 'coarse and bestial' notion that a kind of cannibalism can procure eternal life. But he feels that he has gone too far, and adds, 'even though it was meant to be taken in a more mystical and allegorical sense, the sound of the words is disgusting.' In St. Paul, 'the table of demons' is of course the table at which the demon is the unseen host, not the table at which his flesh is eaten. I think we may agree with Dobschütz that 'the unique sacramental conception of the early Church, which has no analogy in the history of religion because it belongs essentially to the Christian religion, has its origin solely in Christian faith and Christian experience.'

It ought to be possible to discuss these questions without any *parti pris*. In the New Testament we can trace two great changes in the form of the new religion. One was a change from a Jewish to a Hellenistic environment, and the other was the gradual evolution of a prophetic and revivalist movement into an organized community. There are three great sayings of Harnack which I commend to you. (1) 'Like every living plant religion only grows

inside a bark. Distilled religion is not religion at all.' (2) The fundamental distinction between Christianity and the group of beliefs which we call Gnosticism is that for the latter 'redemption meant the separation of what had been unnaturally conjoined, while to the Christian it meant the union of what had been unnaturally divided.' (3) 'Theology was enabled to follow the slightest pressure of popular religion, and it is here that we discover the final clue to the singular enigma now before us. The theology of the mysteries and of various layers and stages afforded the best means of preserving the spiritual character of the Christian religion upon the upper level, and at the same time of arranging any compromise that might be desirable upon the lower. This came about quite naturally, for everything was already present in germ at the very first step, when sacraments were admitted into the religion.'

This last passage presents very clearly and fairly the case for institutional Catholicism. It was the best way of preserving not only the lower kind of religion, but the higher. A devout Catholic never admits that his religion is less spiritual than that of the Protestant. It is the religion of human nature, human nature, he says, at its best, though also of human nature with its weaknesses. And Harnack also sees that though St. Paul is often and justly claimed as the father of Protestantism, he is also, on another side, the father of Catholicism.

We are brought back to Loisy's argument, that Catholicism is historically that into which Christianity has grown, and that the germs of future developments can be easily traced in the books of the New Testament. Can we, he asks, really treat the whole of Church history as the progressive corruption of the pure spiritual religion of the Gospels? Was the original Gospel at all like the religion of the modern Liberal Protestant? Is not Harnack's picture arrived at only by minimizing the apocalyptic side of Christ's preaching, and by suppressing some unwelcome aspects of St. Paul's Epistles?

Although personally I am perhaps more alive to the defects of institutionalism than to its merits, I do not think we can deny that the solidifying and centralizing of the Church under a hierarchy was quite inevitable. 'A distilled religion,' as Harnack says, 'is no religion at all.' At any rate it has been proved many

times that the effects of revivalism are evanescent, unless they give rise to an organization in which some at least of their energy may be preserved and canalized. A Church, after all, is not a mere school of the saints; it has to influence and improve a much larger number who are not saints, and to set its mark upon the course of civilization. Christ Himself preached to crowds containing thousands of people, and compared the 'kingdom of heaven' to a net cast into the sea, bringing up fish of all kinds.

At the same time, the perversion of the Gospel into a kingdom very much of this world, and the reintroduction of nearly all the unspiritual beliefs and rites against which the old prophets protested, is a very grievous thing, and it is not easy to admit that it was at all inevitable in the case of a society with such an origin. Loisy, true to his Catholic training, simply ignores the other Churches which claim to be built on the one true Foundation. The Roman Church, he assumes, is the one genuine outcome of the Galilean Gospel. This of course we cannot admit. But the same stiffening and the same narrowness which we deplore in the Roman Church have appeared in other branches, including our own.

The truth seems to be that though an institutional Church is right and necessary, it needs periodical refreshment by new outpourings of spiritual religion, and there is always a danger that these may be repressed or driven outside the pale. 'We forbade him because he followeth not us' is always more congenial to the hierarchy than 'he who is not against us is on our side.' But these flowering times of the spiritual life are unaccountable and unpredictable. The wind bloweth where it listeth. The Gospel itself was the greatest of these spiritual awakenings, and we know that the highly-organized Jewish Churches could not understand or make room for it.

This also must be said in conclusion, that the naive supernaturalism of the early Church bears a rather different aspect when it is maintained in an age of science by modern ecclesiastics. All the claims and pretensions which may be summed up in the word sacerdotalism are utterly preposterous under present conditions, when the whole nation is fairly well educated, and when moral and spiritual influence is open to all, laity as well as clergy, who show themselves fit to exercise it. When the

bishops, or the Church Assembly, claim to be the living voice of the Church, they are really narrowing the Church unjustifiably. Poor Korah Dathan and Abiram may now claim that 'all the Lord's people are prophets,' without deserving to be swallowed up by the earth. The Church, in fact, is now the nation on its religious or spiritual side, and as such it must be more loosely organized than the hierarchy of the Middle Ages, who really did represent most of the brains, learning, and piety of their countrymen. We must dispense with those rather questionable claims and methods which made the mediaeval Church so powerful. Our monopoly is gone, and with it the opportunities of gain and power which monopoly brings with it. The claim is still made by the Roman Church, but to speak plainly it cannot be honestly enforced. Without a control of popular education it cannot maintain itself.

Nor can we go back to the unorganized Church of the New Testament, groups of little societies in the midst of a pagan society. We must have our own group, to be sure, the Church of England, the most liberal, comprehensive, and elastic of all the Churches, and happily, at present, the most free from all unholy alliances with political parties. If we can really arrive at the group-mind of such a body, it ought to carry, and would carry great weight. But in a wider sense the Church for us is 'the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world,' not an 'invisible Church,' but from the nature of things a body which can be united only by 'the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.' Any attempt at a more rigid organization could only result in excluding many who ought to be inside, and admitting many who ought to be outside. One flock the Church of Christ must always be; one fold it can never be again. Nor need we regret it. Let us think rather of the great Church as an orchestra, in which the different Churches play on different instruments, while our divine Conductor calls the tune.

THE CHURCH AS A DIVINE FELLOWSHIP

By the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D.

FOR what purpose has the Church come into existence? What function does it discharge in the spiritual life of humanity.

The answer I would make is that it exists primarily and fundamentally for the worship of the God whom Jesus Christ revealed in His life and death and victory over death. This worship implies a religious view of life and of the world. It stands for values that are in their nature spiritual and eternal. Too often the Church has been limited in its outlook; it has been narrow, bigoted, intolerant; too often it has been made the instrument of political aims, or an agency hostile to progress, a pillar of the *status quo*. Yet even at the worst, voices from within it have insisted on a spiritual view of life which ought to determine all thought and conduct. To-day we live in a world that has grown more and more mechanical. We feel ourselves mere cogs in a vast and intricate machine. Human life and its ways seem to throw contempt on the ideas of God and immortality. Sabatier's famous dictum that 'man is incurably religious' seems to be refuted by hosts of people who have not merely ceased to attend church, but who have made up their minds that life can be lived quite satisfactorily without any belief in the spiritual world. Of these only a comparative few are professed atheists; the great mass do not deny God, they simply ignore Him. But within the Church itself can it be said that there is that enthusiasm for God which marked primitive Christianity? On the contrary, many who have not broken with the outward fellowship of the Christian Society and who still appreciate the moral and social blessings which religion can bestow, are, nevertheless, indifferent to religion itself, that is, to faith in a real and living God. In the present situation it cannot be sufficiently emphasized that whatever other purposes the Church can and ought to subserve, such as the evangelizing of the unchurched classes, missionary propaganda, the application of Christian principles to the moral and social

wrongs of our time, the one primary article by which it stands or falls, is its witness to the spirituality of life, its defence of the soul against the overwhelming weight of material things which threatens to crush out all spontaneity, all sense of life's real significance. In a word, the Church as a community organized for worship is first and foremost *a witness to the reality of God.*

The study of God, then, is pre-eminently the study to which this generation of Christians is called. We must steep our minds afresh in the simple but profound teaching of Jesus about God.

One of the difficulties which beset many minds when they think of God is the vagueness and indefiniteness of what is meant by the word. 'What a dim shadow,' writes Maurice, 'thrown it would seem from our own minds, has often been before us when we were kneeling to the Majesty of heaven! What a strong self-congratulation that we were performing an act of worship, good and desirable, to *some* Being; but to *what* Being we hardly dared to ask.'[1] Now the task which Jesus set Himself was to give man a clear, vivid, pure and inspiring conception of God. It is unnecessary to say that Jesus did not create the idea of God. Long ages before His day, the consciousness had been the possession of the race. Greek thought and Hindu wisdom and Jewish prophecy had scaled dizzy heights of inspiration and intuition, and to these sources we still return when we would feel the greatness, the majesty, the unutterable glory of the universal Spirit. But it was the unique achievement of Jesus to find in God a new and unrealized Power in life, somewhat as in our own day the ministers of science have discovered in the mysterious forces of the physical universe great practical agencies in the development of civilization. He unveils the God of whom men had prophesied and about whose ways they had argued, and He unveils Him in a new and entrancing light. From the distant heavens He comes down to our familiar earth and is disclosed as a Power that raises life to its highest potential, enhances personality and gives man the victory over himself and the world. He is the indwelling Life that lifts our souls into a clear and serene atmosphere, sets free our psychic powers and awakens all our dormant possibilities. And He is all this because Jesus reveals Him as boundless, uncalculating, self-sacrificing Love. It is in the Para-

[1] *The Lord's Prayer*, p. 289.

bles that the mind of Jesus is especially expressed. The parables of the Prodigal Son and the Lost Sheep are a window through which we may see God as Jesus especially loved to portray Him. For Him God is no static Deity, He is an energizing, dynamic Personality. He seeks, saves, heals, and blesses the human soul; He meets with gracious tenderness the first stumbling step of the penitent. Christ's view of God is frankly anthropomorphic. Of necessity it must be so. If we are to think of God to any real purpose it must be in terms of our ideal humanity. But it is precisely here that many persons of a religious temper find a real difficulty. The Report on 'The Christian Doctrine of God,' compiled by the Lambeth Committee, rightly calls attention to the 'intellectual confusion' which marks 'the ideas associated with the Divine name in the popular mind.'[2] It appears to be very difficult for the unspeculative intellect to avoid carrying over to the idea of the Divine Personality, the finitude and arbitrariness, the weakness and imperfection, which are elements in the idea of human personality. Hence many have abandoned or imagine that they have abandoned belief in God as personal, and have betaken themselves to faith in an omnipresent impersonal 'Law' or 'Principle,' acting with the inevitableness and uniformity of gravitation or chemical affinity. Still further it must be noted that many have found in this changed view of God a peace and a comfort which had been denied them under the influence of traditional religion.

In a questionnaire sent out a few years ago in America to persons of varying degrees of culture, among the queries put was this: 'If you have ever engaged in prayer, to whom or to what were your prayers directed?' Among the answers were these:

'As a child I believed in a personal God; now I believe in the great moral Force for good.'

'Formerly (I prayed) to a personal Deity, later to a supposed controlling Spirit of the Universe.'

'To an anthropomorphic God until the time when reason asserted itself; since then to some Force or Power, I know not what.'

[2] Report of a Committee of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, with the Resolutions based upon it, p. 18.

'To a Divine Creative Principle.'

One is reminded of Coleridge's complaint that in his day there was 'an increasing unwillingness to contemplate the Supreme Being in His personal attributes.'[3]

The writers quoted believe, as has been said, that 'even the most loving man may sometimes fail in loving, but Love itself can never fall short of loving. Our folly may annoy or infuriate him; but Wisdom will never forget to be wise and Goodness will never be impatient, and Love can never see death.' Ideas of this order bear witness to aspects of truth that have been neglected in the Church's ministry. And yet they are themselves one-sided, and, if taken as they stand, misleading and inadequate. As a matter of fact, however, their power to injure is to some extent nullified by the subconscious force of teaching which, however imperfect, bears witness to a still more important truth. Apart from the obvious consideration that 'Goodness,' 'Wisdom,' 'Principle' and all such abstractions are impersonal and have no meaning whatever except as revealed in and through the personal life, it must be emphasized that since the demand of religion is for fellowship with God, for a mutual give-and-take, each partner in the covenant must be able to say 'I' and 'Thou.' A God to whom we cannot pray, to all intents and purposes, is no God at all. Moreover, what we must maintain is that our interpretation of God should be in terms of what is *really* the highest and greatest within us. As Canon Streeter has reminded us, while we must use the language of symbol and picture in our thinking about God, we must be careful to choose the least inadequate of these.'[4]

Jesus is the great Humanist. The pictures in which He embodies His thought of God imply that man cannot worship anything less than the best in himself. He avoids deliberately all impersonal terms. He never compares God to a natural phenomenon such as the sun or the ocean. It is in man and in man only that He can find the elements of His portrait of the Invisible. Even in bad men such as the Unjust Judge He sees something in which we can build a great inference about the Divine char-

[3] *Aids to Reflection*, Sect. 16. Compare the remark of Mr. J. C. Powys in his striking novel, *A Glastonbury Romance*: 'Few modern persons as intelligent as Owen Evans believed as intensely as he did in the existence of a personal God.'

[4] *Reality*, p. 8.

acter. Man is for Him indeed the true Shekinah, the partial manifestation of an unseen glory. 'If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give good things to them that ask Him?' God is like a gracious Creditor who freely forgives a heavily-burdened debtor. He is like a Gardener who cherishes the faintest possibilities of life hoping for better things against all outward seeming. He is like a good Father whose generous love blots out the sinful past of his child and rewards him not according to his deeds but according to the riches of his own beautiful and gracious nature. A New Testament writer has summed it all up in a never to be forgotten word: 'God is Love.' That is the greatest word ever said about God. 'If one were to paint God and get His likeness,' says Luther, 'he must paint such a picture as would be pure love; and if he could paint and make a likeness of love, he would have to make such a picture as would be God Himself.'[5]

When we say that God is love we mean that there is nothing in Him greater, nothing that limits or qualifies it, that it is of His very essence. God is holy, but He is holy in His love. God is Almighty, but His power is the instrument of His love. God is just, but His justice is not modelled on man's notion of rendering evil for evil and good for good; it is rather that of a Father among His children, who sends His rain upon the just and the unjust and causes His sun to shine on the evil and on the good, whose nature is to give, and whose love is inexorable in its determination to bless and save. Christ takes love as He finds it in human life, purges it of its weakness and perversity, cleanses it of its desire to possess, and makes dominant the quality of generous self-impartation. And the love He has thus transformed He identifies with the Godhead. Hence Ritschl is right when he says that 'the perfect name of God which corresponds to the Christian revelation is "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."' This apostolic characterization was the fruit of reflection on the unparalleled experience of God revealed in the life of Jesus. What impressed the first disciples was the relation in which their Master stood to God. That relation was so close, so intricate, that they could not think of God as Father

[5] Quoted by Haering, *The Christian Faith*, p. 346.

without thinking of Jesus as His Son. The life of the Son on earth was a genuine revelation of the Divine Character, a correct picture of God's dealings with His children.

The greatness and the limitation of the older revelation come out in a phrase which must have been familiar to Jesus: 'Like as a father pitieth His children, so the Lord pitieth *them that fear him*.' The glory of the new word is that the Lord pities them that do *not* fear Him with a pity that is always drawing them to repentance.

You will search in vain all the religions of mankind for such a conception of God. The philosophical Buddhist knows no personal Spirit, but hands man over to the remorseless working of an impersonal law. Mohammed glorifies God as the All-Merciful, the Compassionate, but He is not bound by the necessities of His nature to be such. He can do as He pleases, subject to no law of right or wrong, for these laws are His own creation and He can unmake them if he so chooses. Out of this concept of the Divine has sprung the fatalism that marks the thought and life of Eastern peoples. Why struggle against a pre-ordained fate? However true it is that the higher religions reveal this or that quality of the Godhead, the indisputable fact remains, that all alike fail to find in God that perfect, selfless love that alone can meet the clamant needs of the human heart. As the ever to be lamented Söderblom has justly said, 'the first and last originality and uniqueness of Christianity consists in this, that unique and absolute Truth has in Christianity the form not of a rule, a law, *Dharma*, nor of ideas or theologies; Christian revelation has the form of a man. God reveals Himself in a human life. In Buddhism, Gotama Buddha reveals the truth about suffering; he reveals a rule of doctrine, and the result is an order of monks. In Christianity Christ reveals not a doctrine, but His own Heavenly Father; the result is the Church, the universal, supernatural fellowship in which the Spirit conveys the forgiveness of sins and eternal life through the means of grace.'[7]

The revelation which Christ makes of God is not merely a matter of teaching. This would be a very inadequate statement of the truth. It was not only by what He taught, but by what He did and what He suffered, and not only by these, but by His

[7] *The Living God*, p. 327.

personality, full of grace and truth, that He has given the world a new insight into the Being and character of God. When He lifts the burden of disease from the bodies and souls of men, saying, 'Take up thy bed and walk,' we behold God the Healer, opposing with all His might the forces of sickness, pain, disorder. When He casts the mantle of charity about an unhappy sinful soul, saying, 'Go and sin no more,' we see God the Redeemer, freeing from the slavery of evil and bestowing the liberty of the life of love. When He ascends Mount Olivet to weep over a doomed city, we see God the Atoner, bearing the burden of an infinite sorrow as He looks on His children, lost to goodness and to truth, wandering in self-created darkness. When He dies upon the Cross His death is not merely one more tragedy added to the myriad tragedies that have stained our earth; it is rather the culmination of a Love that shrinks from no sacrifice however great, no anguish however poignant, but goes forth to meet the worst that fate and time can do, in perfect assurance that it will and must prove victorious in the end. 'The hideous spectacle of the Cross which is abhorrent to every civilized taste' is transformed by the love that makes it possible into the everlasting sign by which that Love speaks to every heart and by which, as I believe, every heart will yet be conquered. It is the glory of Christ that thus by His words, His acts, His sufferings, and by the Spirit of which these are the expression, He is for ever speaking about God. He points men away from Himself to His Father and our Father, His God and our God.

I have read of a little child who, on being left alone for the night by his mother, felt sore afraid and said, 'Am I to be left alone in the dark?' 'Yes, my dear,' said the mother, 'but you know God is with you all the time.' And the child replied, 'Oh yes, I know God is here, but I want *someone with a face*.' That child unconsciously voiced the deepest need of our souls. Philosophers and theologians and seers have told us that God is here. But we need something more. We feel that if only we had a clear vision of Him, if only we could be sure of Him as we are sure of a tried and trusted friend, all would be well, and our darkness would be as the light. It is Christ who alone can give us this sense of reality. It is in His face that we see reflected the light of the knowledge of the glory of God. We must beware, as Rothe says, lest Christ should in any way conceal from us the

God whom He wishes to reveal and declare.[8] His own witness is that 'the Son can do nothing but what He seeth the Father do.' And the secret of His power to reveal Him lay in this, that His personality was so interpenetrated with His experience of God that in Him He lived, moved and had His being. The more one studies His acts and works, the more one is convinced that He can be explained only by the intensity of His consciousness of God. For Him the world meant nothing, God meant everything. That is His open secret. All other men, even the greatest of the prophets, had dimmed their vision of God by the shadows of their own weakness and imperfection; but no shadow rested on the glory of God as it broke on the perfect soul of Christ.

The teaching of the Churches about God must be judged and criticized by ever-renewed comparison with the thought of Christ. The Roman Catholic Church is to-day straining every effort to win the English-speaking world. And as we know there are many in the Anglican Communion whose only barrier to surrender is the papal supremacy. But in the case of some of us the quarrel with Rome does not lie there. With reasonable safeguards the Pope might be accepted as the visible Head and Representative of the Church. But what we cannot accept is the Roman conception of the Christian revelation which is in hopeless contradiction to the mind of Christ. It changes the centre of gravity from faith in the God whom we have found through Christ, in His words and deeds, His life and death, to faith in a consecrated wafer in which God is embodied. Here we have magic not reason, a sign, a miracle before which we must bow but about which no intelligible word can be said. But everywhere in the Gospels we find Christ making an appeal to the reason; He commends His idea of God as a reasonable idea and therefore worthy of acceptance by every reasonable creature.

We reject the doctrine of the Mass because it implies a conception of God which cannot be reconciled with the spirituality, universality and sweet reasonableness of Christ's teaching. And for the same reason we must reject the Roman Catholic doctrine of an everlasting hell, even in the softened form advocated by Von Hügel. We cannot believe in the existance of a realm to which a vengeful Deity condemns men to suffer endlessly as a fit reward for the evil they have done on earth. Suffering in the

[8] *Still Hours*, p. 216.

world beyond is what men bring on themselves by refusal of a Father's forgiving love; and just as suffering here in one form or another awakens the soul to a consciousness of its estrangement from God and of its helplessness, so we are justified in believing that in that 'sad, sequestered state' after death, suffering will bring there also its stern but salutary message. Wherever the human spirit is, in this world or in any other world, God is, and wherever God is, Love is. And without that faith I cannot see how we can make anything of human existence or of God's dealings with man here and now. We must assert that God's will is the will of a Being whose nature is holy love, and therefore that His purpose must be to make all His children like Himself. Can the power or wickedness of man frustrate that purpose?

And now let us turn for a few moments to a very different type of teaching which is affecting the religious thought of Germany and which has its repercussions in America and Great Britain. Professor Karl Barth is to-day the most famous religious teacher in continental Europe. His fame dates from 1919, when he published his commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans* —a large volume written in a German style which reminds an English reader of Carlyle's use of our language. We are not here concerned with the Barthian theology as a whole, the discussion of which would require not a few paragraphs but a volume. But every theology can be tested by the idea of God, with which it starts and in which it ends. Barth's teaching may be described as an attempted rehabilitation of a Calvinistic Deity. The fatal flaw in all his reasoning, powerful as it is, is seen in his acceptance of the Old Testament thought of God as on the same level with that of the New. He has little to say about the Fatherhood of God, but he strains language to glorify His sovereignty. God is, for him, 'wholly other than man.' He is the great Incognito. Every idea that we can form of Him is wrong. Between God and man there is a yawning gulf on the brink of which man stands in utter impotence, and unless God steps forth and miraculously lifts him over the gulf, there is no hope for him.

'God is ever transcendent to man,' he writes, 'new, remote, foreign, surpassing, never in man's sphere, never in man's possession; whoso says God, says miracle. Indeed God stands as Either-Or before man's soul; over against God, there is there-

fore an electing or rejecting, an affirming or negating, a waking or a sleeping, understanding or misunderstanding of man. But possible, probable, visible and accessible is ever only that rejection, denial, over-sleeping, and mis-knowing of God, that non-seeing of the Invisible, that non-grasping of the Ungraspable. As surely as man has no organ for miracle, so surely all human experience and understanding directly vanish there where it begins in God.'[9]

While the Roman divine asserts God's miracle-working power in the transformation of the substance of material things, the Barthian theologian sees it in the mysterious event by which man who has no inkling of God suddenly and mysteriously becomes aware of Him, and the 'No' of the universe is changed supernaturally into a 'Yes.' A recent critic has well said that 'Professor Barth does not bring us any good news about God; he brings us bad news about ourselves. The result is that Jesus becomes not a revelation but a riddle.' A God who hides Himself from man and gives no hint of His character in Nature or in the human soul, a Christ who cannot be really known after the flesh, that is, in history, a world of mortals imprisoned within the iron bars of sin and death — such is the pessimistic outlook of this great German thinker. Over against it stands the message of Jesus that God is ever close to us, that not fear before His awful transcendent majesty but joy in His loving, helpful presence should be the prevailing note of Christian piety. Christ's own earthly life was penetrated and saturated with a feeling of filial happiness, which, save for a brief moment, was never disturbed by the pains and wrongs He endured. It is this life of joy in God that He would have all men experience. When He appears as a public teacher He begins by telling men about God and His Kingdom, but He assumes that they know something that is true about both. And throughout His teaching He constantly reminds them that if they look within their own souls they will find a direct road to God, because there is in every man a something that allies him with the divine. On that fundamental truth alone can a sound and abiding theology be built, and it is because of it that the Church of redeemed souls can claim to have fellowship with God and with His Son Jesus Christ.

[9] R. B. Hoyle's translation in *The teaching of Karl Barth*, pp. 108-109.

CREATIVE WORSHIP

By the Rev. Canon Harold Anson, M.A.

I HAVE been asked to speak to you to-day on the subject of creative worship. Perhaps the easiest approach to the subject is to consider the actual meaning of the word 'worship.' Worship means 'worth-ship,' that is, the element of worth or value in an object, and the word comes to be used not simply as a noun, but as a verb, which then means to give expression to our sense of value. Life, without expression of value, would be void of all significance; that which gives beauty and dignity to life is the feeling that some things are of more value than others. If we regard all objects as having equal value, life is tasteless and void. So long as we look at the world in terms of its value to *us*, we lose the sense of beauty and significance in life; it is only when we are able to realize the beauty of life in itself and apart from our own interests, as expressed in forms of infinite variety, that we rise above the desire merely to gratify appetite, and are able to give expression to the joy which comes of realizing the pattern of life, regardless of its value to our own individual desires.

We are surely right in believing that all living creatures express in some way or other this feeling of the value of life, and so give expression to what we mean by worship. George Tyrrell says that when the rooks say 'Caw, caw,' they are giving expression to worship. Many people would, I suppose, say that when the rook says 'Caw, caw,' he is doing nothing more than expressing his pleasure in his food or his family life; but I believe that Mr. Clutton-Brock was right when he used to say with such passionate emphasis that birds do not sing merely to attract their mate or to express their pleasure in having had a good dinner, but because it is their natural expression of joy in living. It is said by some people that the colour of flowers is due merely to a desire to attract the attention of an insect, but some of the most beautiful flowers come at a time of year when there are no insects, and when fertilization by insects is not necessary—but the colour and beauty persists. I believe that

we are not wrong in supposing that the beauiful colours, shapes and scents of flowers are a spontaneous expression of their joy in living.

All human beings have some sense of value. They regard some objects as having deeper significance than others; but at the lower levels of human life value is connected chiefly with the gratification of some purely selfish desire. Horses, for instance, to many people only suggest gambling, sheep suggest mutton, human beings suggest possible means of annexing them as instruments of our own interest to be used as our chattels. But this expression of pleasure in other people and things, even if it is a pleasure in regarding them merely as instruments for our own self-expression, is in itself a form of worship, though a very corrupted form. When a connoisseur of wine samples his glass of port and sips it slowly and with infinite relish, he is not, I imagine, receiving pleasure simply from the fact that the wine is doing him good; there is some element of pleasure in the aroma of the wine itself. There is, that is to say, some element of worship, that is, of the expression of joy in the beauty of life. The worship of Bacchus, as we now know, did not consist purely of the pleasure in getting drunk, but it was the expression also of the ecstatic beauty of the sensuous element in life.

The life of worship develops when we are able to get away from regarding all life in terms of our own advancement and are able to take a wholly unselfish pleasure in the significance of life apart from our own desires. It is, at all events, one part of what we mean by the worship of God, a worship, or sense of value in life, conceived as an outpouring of beauty, goodness and truth. It is when we are able to stand aside, as it were, and rejoice in the beauty of life, forgetting for the moment that which we can get out of it for ourselves, that we enter fully into the worship of God.

I believe that most Englishmen would believe that this contemplation of the beauty and dignity of life is a valuable part of experience, though they would, for the most part, be very surprised to hear that it had anything to do with worship. Most men, I think, would agree, if it were suggested to them, that it is a good thing from time to time to stand apart from life, regarded merely as a means of gaining a living, and to contem-

plate the beauty of living for its own sake; but if you were to go on to suggest to them that it is necessary to give any formal expression of this sense of value at particular times and places, the natural shyness and reserve of an Englishman would at once make him suspicious that you were trying to inveigle him into saying more than he really meant. It is singularly characteristic of the Englishman to be suspicious of all exaggerated expression. The American, when he feels enthusiastic either about his country or his party, feels no embarrassment in walking in a procession carrying a flag and shouting his feelings for an hour at a time; the German loves to proclaim in public the greatness of the German idea; but the Englishman, who is by nature incredulous of all over-expression, suspects such activities at once as savouring of hypocrisy. The American, living in a small town, loves to call it a city; the Englishman is much more likely to call it a village. The American very easily can be induced to talk to you about his ancestors; the Englishman, if he is of illustrious lineage, will feel hot and uncomfortable if it is mentioned. I think that this singular characteristic is responsible in large measure for the suspicion which attaches, in our own country, to any flamboyant expressions of the worship of God; the Englishman prefers to express less than he thinks rather than run the danger of expressing more belief than he is prepared to act upon.

Thus, the ordinary man finds himself greatly in agreement with St. James's definition of true religion as the visiting of the fatherless and widows in their affliction and the keeping of oneself unspotted from the world; and it is very necessary to remind ourselves that this idea of the true worship of God as consisting in acts of kindness and charity is, after all, the main burden of the teaching of the Hebrew Prophets and of the gospel as preached by our Lord Himself. It may be a matter of doubt whether the great Hebrew Prophets attached any importance at all to the sacrifices and ceremonial observances of the Temple worship; but, whether they went as far as Jeremiah, who said that God not only took no pleasure in material sacrifices, but that He had never ordered them at all, or whether they merely denounced the corruption of the ritual services, it is quite certain that the great burden of their message was that the

worship of God revealed itself in a habit of mind which expressed itself in works of humility and benevolence. The creed of the Prophets was summed up in the great saying: 'What doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but that thou love justice and mercy and walk humbly with thy God.'

Our Lord in this, as in so many other ways, was in line with the Hebrew Prophets. He also seems to have taken remarkably little interest in the formal worship of the Jewish Church. So far as we know, He never took part in a sacrifice, though He attended the Passover; but the whole burden of His message is that our duty to God is mainly carried out in works of charity to our fellow-men. The criterion of judgment at the Last Day is whether we have fed the hungry, clothed the naked and visited the prisoners. So St. John would say that if we have not learnt to love our brother, whom we have seen, we cannot learn to love God, whom we have not seen.

I think it is necessary to lay stress upon this aspect of Christ's teaching in order to do full justice to the very strong intuitive feeling in the minds of almost all the more thoughtful men of our own generation that we worship God best by action and not by taking part in formal acts of devotion. The whole movement of Humanism, which is so characteristic of our own day, is not necessarily out of line with the teaching of Christ, even if we believe that it has a one-sided emphasis, and that it is also liable to very rapid and serious corruption. Canon Barry, in one of his writings, pours scorn on the popular religion of 'being kind to granny and the cat.' No doubt he is right in believing that there is very much more in the worship of God than that; but, at the same time, we must remember that being kind to granny is very often a very real test of the genuineness of religion, and that our Lord, we may well believe, would have attached great value to the religion of one who had learnt this aspect of devotion to God.

We must, then, do full justice to this side of religion. Yet we must realize how extremely open this religion of good works is to corruption. It may be, no doubt, a very real expression of the worship of God to build a hospital; but a man may build a hospital from a variety of motives. He may build it because he loves the sick and wishes to help them, or because it is the easiest

way of gaining a peerage, or because he feels at a loss for something to do and takes pleasure in organizing a great public work. A man may become a missionary either from the noblest and most self-sacrificing motives, or because he takes pleasure in bossing an inferior race and enjoys a form of domination which he could not easily acquire in his own country. The man who takes pleasure in any form of philanthropy always stands in danger of becoming a professional philanthropist, and the professional philanthropist is in just as great danger of losing his soul, and becoming a noxious element in society at the same time, as the professional religionist is. The man who says that he finds an adequate object of worship in his fellow-men nearly always becomes, in the long run, disillusioned; because man in the concrete never is, and never can become, an adequate object of worship.

Bishop Gore used to say, after quoting St. John's dictum that, if you do not love your brother whom you have seen, you cannot love God whom you have not seen, that *his* great difficulty was that he found it so much easier to love his brother when he had *not* seen him. He quoted the case of Belgian refugees, and said how filled with affection for Belgians he had felt until he actually had to entertain them. We cannot, therefore, be very much surprised when we find that people who are very loud in their expression of the love of humanity as an adequate and satisfying religion, are very often singularly unsuccessful in expressing their love in their own households, to their parents, their servants and their nearest neighbours. In fact, the further off their neighbours are from them, the more easy they find it to regard them as adequate objects of love. It needs a supreme religious genius to be able to see everyone as an object of love. The ordinary mother is able to see in a baby capacities and beauties which appear to the outsider to be completely lacking; the artist is able to see in people whom we should regard as ugly and uninteresting some essential beauty which, having seen, he is able to reveal to us in his artistic expression. So you can only love humanity if you see in humanity something very much deeper than a collection of average men and women; when you can see an ideal striving with very small success to express itself through overwhelming obstacles; that is what is meant by

being able to love God in man. The first Christians found their love of man enormously widened and deepened because, having come to love Jesus, they saw that there was a possibility of the spirit and character of Jesus being developed in every man and woman, and, when once the spirit of Jesus had entered into them, they began to see, as He had seen, the beauty of human life revealed in all sorts of disagreeable characters which, without that spirit in them, they would have passed by in contempt and indifference.

True worship, then, cannot be regarded as simply loving either nature or humanity; either humanity as a whole or certain individuals in humanity. Human nature can only become an adequate object of worship if we see in it the infinite capacity of man to rise out of himself and to become one with the Source of all beauty and life. You cannot love your fellow-men unless you have before you the love of God in man.

We now come to a further difficulty as to whether it is necessary to express our sense of value in God in any such formal way as 'public worship' in its traditional sense. There are many people who would go as far as we have already gone very readily, and yet say that the public worship of the Church means nothing to them at all; and not only means nothing, but is a positive hindrance to spiritual worship. Why is it that the formal worship of the Church is felt by so many people to be a real stumbling-block in the way of religion? No doubt in many cases it may be because people are frivolous and worldly, and want some excuse for avoiding a surrender of any part of their time and energies to deeper thought; but I do not believe that this is a satisfactory explanation for the widespread feeling that public worship is not helpful. I think we have to remember that public worship always implies that it is the worship of a Church, and that a Church is a community of people who are filled with the spirit of Christ. Public worship ought to be a solemn expression, in the finest art of music, architecture and word, of the living faith of a *community* penetrated by the spirit of Christ: but too often this is by no means the case. Too often what is called the worship of the Church is, in reality, only a conventional recitation of the beliefs of a generation that has long since disappeared, of a community of people who have for long been

spiritually dead (but, unfortunately, not yet buried). You feel instinctively that the forms which are used are forms which once, long ago, meant something to somebody; they must have meant a great deal to people in the past, but only with an infinite degree of translation and explanation could they be made to mean anything to people of the present day. The forms in themselves are beautiful enough; we may well believe that they had a very real relation to problems which were felt to be pressing ones centuries ago, but they have no significance at all for the people who are using them now.

In the town where I live, in a quiet country road, there is a very well-equipped and up-to-date lifeboat standing in the middle of the road. It is carefully painted from time to time, there is a danger signal in front of it which tells people to go 'dead slow,' and I often think that it is typical of many religious communities that we know. The lifeboat is admirably equipped; the only difficulty is that it is thirty miles from the sea and, therefore, standing where it is, it is totally irrelevant and meets no need of any kind; it merely forms an obstruction. So where a religious community has long lost any sense that it is expressing a common spirit towards the actual pressing problems of life, and where it is merely reciting the almost unintelligible utterances of people whose circumstances were spiritually different from its own, we cannot be surprised that people do not find in this dreary recitation any sense that they are expressing the true values of living.

Professor Whitehead quite truly complains of Modernists that they confine themselves to repairing those things which are past repair: 'The defect of the liberal theology of the last two hundred years is that it has confined itself to the suggestion of minor, vapid reasons why people should continue to go to church in the traditional fashion.'

One cannot help feeling that an immense amount of energy and money is quite uselessly expended in keeping alive forms and organizations which have long ceased to function. In my vicarage backyard there is a pump which, about a century ago, supplied water to the house. The well has long since dried up and there is an ample water-supply available from the local Water Company; but the Diocesan authorities are careful to

make me paint the pump every five years, in the hope, I suppose, that some day it may be available again for use. So I think there are many churches where the clergyman has for many years felt that he has nothing either that he wants to say or that he feels that people wish to hear. Yet he is obliged by law to preach twice every Sunday, and large sums of money are used in maintaining him in a position which he himself knows very well to be of little value to anyone.

It is, however, so easy for any of us to see what is wrong; the difficulty is to see what ought to be substituted for a system which is so largely in a state of irreparable dilapidation. I don't think that we ought to blame people who only see what is wrong and do not yet see any positive cure; that is, after all, the position of many of the Hebrew Prophets.

But we do clearly see that the first step needed in order to make our worship creative is that we should be clear about the nature of the God Whom we worship. I am sure that many people have been taught that you can only come to God by the process of stripping off your love for all created things and persons. The love of nature, of people, of country, all are loves which are in competition with the love of God, and it is only, so people have been taught, by ceasing to love these things that you can love God. Canon Barry has pointed out how preachers are wont to ask people if they cannot spare one half-hour in the day for communion with God, implying that all their business life and all their home life is something other than communion with God. I am sure that we have got to stress the fact that communion with God is normally to be found through a richer quality of love and service to our fellow-creatures.

'What I try to prove,' says George Tyrrell, 'is that every man, honest or dishonest, does at least subconsciously believe in God, by the mere fact that he believes in truth and right and disbelieves in falsehood and wrong. God, for me, is creative power that pushes everything on towards its higher development. The principle of life, and health, and growth, and truth, and goodness. I know it as I know electricity—in its effects, not in itself. It is convenient to *think* of electricity as a fluid or current, for its effects suggest that image; and it is convenient to think or speak of God as an etherealized, immensified, infinitely

wide, kind of strong man. It works well. What He is, in Himself, we cannot know, owing to the fact that our minds are made for the physical, finite, material order of things.'

I believe myself that if people once understood that they met together for worship in order to deepen their communion with that Being Who is the source of all their love for created things, that public worship would appeal very much more than it does to people who love the world with all that is best in themselves.

I think also that if we are to make worship creative, we must remember that it must be worship by a *fellowship* or church, and not merely by a chance aggregation of people with warring interests who merely happen to live together in proximity. So long as our civilization is built up mainly on competition, so long as our congregations expend their time, for the most part, during the week in trying to out-bid their neighbours, I do not see how a religious fellowship can function whose worship can be creative of anything which has spiritual value. But where a congregation is, in any real sense, a community of people who have common interests and who are living normally in fellowship during the week, then a live church can be built up.

I believe that we are witnessing to-day the disintegration of a society built up on the principles of competition among individuals, and for it is gradually being substituted a society founded on the principle of co-operation. In such a society creative worship will be possible in a degree which is not possible now.

There are some smaller difficulties which have to be overcome before reality can be given to worship. It is now possible, since the introduction of *Songs of Praise*, to have a wider choice of hymns which do not contradict the normal aspiration of sensible people. It is, I think, much more difficult to find lessons out of the Old Testament for every Sunday in the year which are of any great value to ordinary people. There is much to be said for choosing the lessons to fit with the teaching of the sermon. Mr. James Adderley has pointed out that, in the 'Second Book of Homilies,' it is suggested to the clergy that they shall choose other lessons than those appointed, where they think well to do so; 'so that your people may have cause

to glorify God for you and be the readier to embrace your labours to your better commendation to the discharge of your conscience and their own.'[1]

I believe that where lessons, hymns and one psalm are carefully chosen, and where the clergyman has a real message which he is anxious to deliver, public worship still has a great attraction, both to the young and old, and that it is not only an exercise which gives pleasure to the mind but that it very really helps to create that atmosphere in homes and business offices which tends to promote the Kingdom of God on earth.

I am sure that we have to overcome a very deep-seated tradition that public worship is connected with a cowardly endeavour to flee from the battle of life, to dodge the storms and the crises of living, instead of to square up to them; to discover ingenious phrases which enable you to say one thing when you believe another, to revel in emotionalism, instead of 'living dangerously.' If we could once make people understand that the God Who is to be worshipped is the God who makes us love discovery, and danger, and change, and the pursuit of beauty at all risks, then, I believe, public worship would again become attractive, not indeed to all people, for many people are naturally lazy and dislike all disinterested effort, and many most conscientious people honestly find no help in any corporate worship, however good, but to most normal people who are really seeking for the creation of the Kingdom of God on earth. Meanwhile, numbers of people have to live in places where the church is as nearly dead as it can be; it is difficult to know what they ought to do. To them, George Tyrrell says: 'Meantime, while that Ark is preparing, what are we poor devils to do, to whom the forms and phrases of the lower Christianity have become

[1] Professor Whitehead suggests, as a way out, 'the replacement of the book of the Revelation of St. John the Divine by the imaginative account given by Thucydides of the speech of Pericles to the Athenians. Neither of them is history: St. John never received just that revelation, nor did Pericles ever make just that speech . . . It is a question for discussion why the more radical schools should not cut entirely free from any appeal to the past, and concentrate entirely upon the contemporary world and contemporary examples. The summary answer is that, so far as an appeal to tradition can be made with complete honesty, without any shadow of evasion, there is an enormous gain in popular effectiveness.'—*Adventures of Ideas*, p. 219.

intolerable in their unreality and irreverence? I suppose to work the work of God in silence is the best sort of prayer under those circumstances, *i.e.* where words have become impossible.'

I do not believe that the present situation is by any means hopeless. There is a great craving for God and there are many people waiting for the coming of the Kingdom. We cannot, however, *make* our worship creative; only God can do that; but if we are trying to frame our lives and our beliefs rightly, God is able to kindle a fire, and indeed I believe it is even now kindled in our midst.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

ITS FUNDAMENTAL BASIS AND JUSTIFICATION

By the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, B.D., M.A., Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral.

THE word 'Authority' may have either one of two meanings, or include both. They are (*a*) *the right to require* assent, loyalty, obedience, and (*b*) *the power to enforce* these things. Historically the Church has claimed and attempted to exercise authority in both senses of the word. But the claim to authority in the sense of 'the power to enforce' (*imperium*) has now been practically abandoned.* Where this abandonment is not the result of a truer insight, circumstances have compelled it. Any such *imperium* as the Church might again conceivably claim, she would exercise only by permission of the State. No modern democratic State would grant it; and political dictators are necessarily jealous gods, not disposed to delegate *imperium* to any Church. Further, Churches and States alike can only enforce outward conformity, which may be dissimulation: they can never enforce the inner assent and loyalty of conscience with which religion is deeply concerned. They may 'kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do,' except face condemnation by civilized mankind. But the Church's authority may be so conceived that, casuistical refinements notwithstanding, in practice it may come to be the control of human spirits by other men acting in the name of Heaven. To this conception of authority the right to exercise coercion lies so near at hand as to appear a logical consequence. Until claims to such right are explicitly renounced by every section of the Church, mention of the fact that it has been made and exercised is not irrelevant in any consideration of the authority of the Church.

'Authority,' in the classical meaning of *auctoritas*, does not necessarily signify *power to coerce* any forms of human activity. It means the right to guide and direct, grounded on the capacity

* The Roman Church has not officially repudiated her claim to the right to persecute.

to impart guidance and direction, and therefore the right to require assent, loyalty and obedience thereto; and it has been generally implied that the guidance in religious faith and morals which authority can impart is such that men could not otherwise discern it with equal clarity, if indeed at all. It is this meaning of the word which is here intended when we speak of the authority of the Church; and it is obvious that in this sense authority in religion is akin to the various kinds of authority on which we must needs rely day by day for the conduct of civilized life.

Equally obvious is the authoritative character of the great religions: they claim that what they teach has the authority of truth. And no religious person believes that his religion is an immature reaction to life which he may outgrow, or that it is based upon speculations which, equally with others, may turn out to be groundless. On the contrary, the oft-renewed strength of irrational reliance on various forms of authority is largely due to the fear of the effects of eliminating authority—the fear that it is the only efficient bulwark against a chaos of individualism, such as would logically lead to complete indifference to the religion of others, implying indifference to truth.

The authority of the Christian Church, whatever the forms of its statement or the means of its exercise, has consistently claimed the same fundamental justification. This could hardly be set forth at once more simply and more adequately than in three statements selected from the opening Resolutions of the last Lambeth Conference:[1]

1. 'We believe that the Christian Church is the repository and trustee of a Revelation of God, given by Himself, which all members of the Church are bound to transmit to others.'

2. 'As Jesus Christ is the crown, so also He is the criterion of all revelation.'

3. 'We believe that the work of our Lord Jesus Christ is continued by the Holy Spirit.'

In other words, the fundamental basis and justification of the Church's authority, on the ground of which she claims the right to require the assent and loyalty of mankind, is the possession of a more adequate knowledge of God than is elsewhere to be found; and further, that this knowledge is a trust committed to her keeping by the self-revelation of God, and is therefore knowledge of truth and progressive.

[1] *Report*, p. 39.

An obvious challenge to such a claim is the existence of other great religions making similar claims. The modern comparative study of religions seems to intensify the challenge. The difficulty of defining religion is complicated by the fact that it permeates and influences such varied human activities that it cannot be isolated from them. But, though the object of religion is so varyingly conceived, and though religion finds expression in such variegated mythologies and theologies, the human needs and attitudes which it awakens and satisfies are characteristically uniform. Awe, veneration, worship, sacrifice, prayer, the sense of human insignificance and guilt, the need of purification, instinctive obedience, the sense of deliverance and joy—these are found in other living religions as well as in Christianity, and also in cults which now possess only historical interest. It is impossible to claim that the spiritual life, experiences and insights within Christianity are real, and to declare them illusions when manifested elsewhere. If we reject the notion that all the phenomena of religion are the result of a grand illusion, we are at once compelled to acknowledge some measure of real knowledge of God and real spiritual life in religion generally, and a great deal in the higher religions. Only those for whom impartial consideration of evidence is inhibited by the groundless certainty of conclusions pre-determined by *a priori* axioms can possibly believe that there is one religion infallibly true and several others wholly false. The Christian Church need make no such claim. God has not left Himself without witness: His everlasting power and divinity are manifested to mankind in varying degrees through the created universe and through those who seek Him. But when Christianity is set among other religions as a historical phenomenon, a problem is presented to which the easy solution is that all religions are relatively true, but that nothing more can be claimed. This conclusion leaves nothing final to which they are relative, and is apt to inhibit those decisions of faith without which there is no progress in religious life, and to issue in scepticism.

The problem is fundamental; but its subject-matter is so vast that it is not surprising that few attempts to grapple with it have so far been made. The outlines of Troeltsch's investigation will illustrate our theme. He denied that the comparative

study of religions reveals such a jumbled mass of values that reliable judgment is impossible. On the contrary, the number of men who have had anything genuinely new to say, and the fundamental thoughts by which men live, are alike few. The cults of primitive and uncivilized peoples, multiform in appearance but monotonous in content, may be disregarded; the higher forms of polytheism are nationally or geographically restricted in influence. There are, in fact, very few great constructions of ethical and spiritual religion. 'In the last resort it is a question of the struggle between at most three or four great leading revelations of the higher religious life, and between the corresponding forms of spiritual culture.'

The great religions, other than Christianity, fall into two classes. Judaism and Islam are religions of Law: they show little sign of ability to transcend limitations of race. Whatever the actual rivalry in certain localities, neither is a serious rival to Christianity in the claim to universality. Hinduism and Buddhism are religions of Redemption: salvation is by enlightenment, to be attained by human effort. The former is fatally handicapped by bondage to a caste system, while the highest forms of Buddhism lead inevitably to monasticism; and both are corrupted by polytheism and superstition to an extent unknown in any form of Christianity. Again, Islam so stresses the absolute power and majesty of God as to set Him above moral distinctions and to make it difficult to ascribe the attributes of holiness and love; while Buddhism, though orginally lacking the idea of God, has been led to the virtual deification of men. Possibly Troeltsch unduly emphasized the contrast between the religions of Law and those of Redemption: doubtless elements of both are to be found in each. 'We should rather speak of two tendencies found in imperfect unity in all these religions.'[2]

Troeltsch's conclusion is that Christianity offers the fullest and most complete revelation of personal religious life: it interprets spiritual reality in terms of such life. For Christianity, God is living and active: He brings human persons into personal fellowship with Himself. The needs of the legal

[2] Sydney Cave, in *The Future of Christianity*, edited by Sir J. Marchant, p. 16.

and redemptive religions are both combined and satisfied. Christianity thus represents the climax and goal of convergence of the tendencies of religious development in the great historical religions.

But Troeltsch did not exclude the possibility of another revelation transcending that embedded in Christianity. He held that Christianity is the only possible religion *for us*; but the obvious fact that, in entirely different cultural conditions, other races may experience contact with the Divine life in very different ways, he regarded as a state of affairs which would be permanent, and he ceased to hope either that the other great religions would disappear by the conversion of their adherents to Christianity, or that these religions would undergo transformation into Christianity: the only hope was for greater mutual understanding. He held that this in no way reduced the obligation to share our religious insights with others, and he regarded unlimited relativity as a degeneration of toleration and as the modern disease afflicting faith. But we cannot ignore the magnitude of the reduction of the historic claim of Christianity involved in his conclusions, or the severe limitations which their acceptance would impose on the authority of the Christian Church—that is, upon her right to require the assent, loyalty and obedience of mankind.

But the science of the comparative study of religions cannot itself prove that Christianity is superior to other religions; still less can it pronounce upon its historic claim to finality. Judgments of truth and of value are not derived from historical studies, nor can they be confined within historico-critical categories. Nor is the truth or finality of any beliefs established merely by finding out how many people share them, and under what forms and conditions. If the Christian revelation of God be true, it is no matter for surprise if the scientific comparison of Christianity with other religions should, in fact, provide evidence for the judgment that Christianity represents the goal of tendencies in them. But belief in the supreme value of the Christian religion does not rest upon any irrefutable demonstration of the inferiority of others. Ultimate postulates are never matters of logical proof, whether in religion or in any other human activities. The conviction of an unique manifestation or

incarnation of God can only be established by a process in which faith is present and active from the first. If the incarnation of God in a historical person be true, and the medium of the highest revelation of God that man can assimilate, there can never be any coercive proof thereof to one who regards all personality as a grievous and evanescent limitation, and all history as belonging to a realm of illusion. If the essential purpose and significance of any revelation is to open the spiritual eyes of men to realities, which they may recognize, but do not create or invent, then the values of that revelation and the question of its finality cannot be adequately judged by those who do not receive or respond to its illumination. It has been and is the claim of the Christian Church to possess data for which a place must be found in any world-view which aspires to truth, and that, if these data are admitted, they will necessarily determine the ultimate valuation of all else. This is the ultimate basis of the authority of the Christian Church.

From the beginning Christianity has been proclaimed with authority. Beyond doubt, Jesus Himself lived, acted and taught as one having authority. He did not put forth His teaching as speculative opinions, critically deduced from and supported by the balancing of opposites. 'Verily, verily' is the note of it all. In this respect, as in others, He both stands within and goes beyond the prophetic succession: 'Thus saith the Lord' becomes 'I say unto you.' The early Christian Church, born of the life, teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus, believed itself to be the climax of a purpose of God which had been continuously directed by Him from the time of Abraham onwards. Throughout its history the Christian Church has held its message to embody God's revelation to man and God's call to man. It has never conceived itself as only one part or aspect of a general movement of man's spirit in its reaching out for God, which it satisfies. Whenever its message authenticates itself with power in the hearts of men, it is not as something self-achieved or self-invented, but as authoritative good news. It comes as the discovery, in Dr. Bevan's phrase, that 'the inner Reality of the universe has looked into human eyes through the eyes of Jesus Christ.' Its authority can be vindicated by subsequent experience, but that involves putting it to the test. It

claims finality because its revelation of the love of God is eternally true. It leads to fuller illumination as it is integrated (as it must be) with the increasing experience and knowledge of mankind; but it claims that human progress in the apprehension of its meaning is not possible save in the light which the revelation itself supplies, such progress being part of it and belonging to it, and never something different. It is *finality of direction*, not finality of formulated statement or of human understanding.

The justification of the authority of the Christian Church is simply the nature of that authority.[3] It cannot, without ceasing to be Christian, be conceived or exercised inconsistently with the revelation whence it is derived. Fundamental to the Christian religion, inseparable from it because an implication of ethical theism, is the supreme value of human personality in the sight of God; not, indeed, on account of anything which persons may claim of God in their own right, but because they are made in His image, and because, for that reason, personality was the vehicle for the supreme revelation of God in history, and because its salvation is the purpose of that revelation. The dignity of God-given moral personality is no less a fundamental truth of Christianity than the self-revealing nature of God; for which reason all attempts to revive a conception of revelation and consequent authority which are inconsistent with ethical personality are efforts to revive the obsolete, and can only result in inadequately moralised religion. Höffding stated the Christian ideal in the words: 'The principle of authority is subordinate to the principle of personality.' The Church's authority is a means, not an end.

On this ground, claims to infallible authority in any form must be rejected as irreconcilable with the fundamental values of Christianity, no less than because infallibility is shown to be non-existent by the evidence of history. Claims to possess and to exercise it are also destructive of all hope of the universal recognition of true Christian authority. The only way to give plausibility to claims to inerrant authority is to set out from

[3] In what follows, I am indebted to Dr. Oman's *Grace and Personality* and to Dr. Tennant's *Philosophical Theology*, vol. II, ch. viii. The positions maintained in these books are in my view so fundamental that treatments of the allied subjects of revelation, grace, and authority which ignore or evade them are worthless beatings of the air.

a priori ideas of what it behoves and befits God to do. If He is omnipotent, and the exercise of His omnipotence is guided by omniscience, then Revelation must be infallible; and He will assuredly provide for its preservation in freedom from error. But such conceptions of the *actual* dealings of God with men create difficulties more unanswerable than any they can remove. If God can ever rightly deal with persons in that way, why does He do so with such parsimonious economy? If He can rightly control some human spirit or spirits, keeping them in the way of inerrant knowledge of truth, why not so control all human persons, and so remove needless limitations? Why use other methods with their inevitable and superfluous consequences of boundless error and failure? If God could ever *rightly* so act towards persons as to override their personal limitations or otherwise than by enabling them to get their own insights, then our ignorances, weaknesses and sins are the easiest of all things for God to remove and the most senseless to permit. Such a conception of God's mode of working is irreconcilable with the fundamental conception of Him as the Father of spirits made in His image, with whom He deals as with sons. That the idea can be held without destroying all worthy conceptions of God's personality and our own is due to evading or overlooking its implications. Irresistible force, overwhelming persons as though they were things, even though it be represented as God's gracious condescension to man, is not personal action, nor does it belong to the sphere of personal relationships.

Nor does the long story of the human search for the knowledge of God anywhere suggest Divine revelation imparted by omniscient omnipotence, such as alleged infallible revelations and authorities imply. The slow progress of the ages is overwhelming testimony to the fact, no less evident from present experience, that God does not so deal with man. It is equally apparent that evolution is towards greater responsibility for our beliefs and actions. The Reformation, itself an effect whose causes extend much further back, was a great movement towards individual responsibility, and the revolt against infallibilities has since increased in strength. Infallibilist authority, discredited by historical enquiry and by reason, cannot roll back history by mere assertion and by demonstrations of how useful

it would be if men would consent to heed its claims. To use Dr. Oman's illustration, the dam of inerrant authority has burst. There have been attempts to rebuild it, and there will be more; and they may appear impressive and encourage hope so long as attention is confined to the dam and the flood is ignored. It is precisely where infallibilist authority has exercised the greatest influence that its rejection is most violent whensoever education and new ideas beget freedom. The significance of this is in no way decreased if the first movement of new freedom is generally from the frying-pan into the fire. Inerrant authority can only maintain itself by tortuous treatment of facts and by fettering the human mind; and the result is to set up an irresolvable conflict between the equally essential requirements of religion for complete dependence upon God and the essentials of moral freedom. These requirements of religious dependence and moral freedom can only be reconciled if revelation and consequent authority consist in enabling men to get their own insights.

If the primary purpose of religious truth is the promotion of a spiritual and personal relationship, it cannot be conveyed by omnipotent deliverance: human reception and understanding are necessarily involved in its imparting. God may utter a Divine word, but only by its human reception and understanding does it become revelation. If an isolated piece of infallible information could be given by God, it would inevitably be received and understood in terms of the particular and partial world-view of one generation; and the rediscovery of the infallible information would still present an insoluble problem for succeeding generations. Only an infallible interpreter could solve the problem, and his existence would involve an impersonal overriding of human conditions inconsistent with the demands of ethical theism and moral personality.

The actual history of Christianity's progress equally affords no grounds for belief in errant revelation as the basis of the Church's authority. Jesus was no less truly human than Divine. This not only involves liability to error,[4] but also the necessity of speaking in the context of a historical setting of ideas. Were

[4] *Actuality* of error in Jesus need not be discussed. It is sufficient to insist that there can be no infallible human judgment that he was not *liable* to err, or that he did not do so.

it otherwise, confession of the humanity of Jesus would be little more than verbal. A Jesus infallibly preserved from error would be a Docetic Jesus—God in the appearance of man, not as becoming man and living a human life. The revelation of God in Jesus, though faith may confess that in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, was transmitted through the very real limitations of its first recipients, who were obviously not preserved from serious errors. In its adaptation to the understanding of other peoples, by which it became capable of universal significance, it intermingled with much else that was transient; its theological development and definition brought in further human elements. The acceptance of formulas does not preclude differences of interpretation, and they are often accepted from other motives than the disinterested love of truth, even if the disinterested love of truth guaranteed its attainment, which manifestly it does not.[5]

The conception of the Church's authority must be compatible with the clear recognition that she is not inerrant whether in faith or morals. Yet the Church has an inevitable, real and justifiable authority for all persons who do not claim for themselves what they deny to the Church. It is recognised that in the last resort the individual must follow conscience, but no instructed person thinks conscience is inerrant. No reasonable person doubts that the expert in any subject speaks with authority in that subject, or that he can give guidance therein which less expert persons are foolish to ignore; but, again, no reasonable person thinks the expert infallible, or is perturbed if he is proved erroneous, as he may well be by his own further study and experience. Science and a growing body of scientific knowledge maintain their prestige, and have greater actual authority than any Church, notwithstanding the changing deliverances of scientific men and their open confessions of imperfect knowledge and ignorance. Similarly the Church may confidently exercise her authority as the right to require assent and loyalty, provided a clear distinction is drawn between authority *as a means of knowing what the truth is* and authority *as the basis of truth*. The expert is trusted, not because he claims his own

[5] These points, and others, are excellently set out in the chapter on Authority in the first volume of Prof. A. E. Taylor's *The Faith of a Moralist*.

authority as the ultimate basis of what he teaches, but because people trust that what he teaches could be verified by any other person with equal qualifications; whereas when authority claims to be *the basis of truth*, the idea of appeal to anything more ultimate than the authority itself is precluded. There are various ways of knowing, and different means whereby ideas and doctrines come to be believed; but the ways by which we attain to ideas and principles ought always to be distinguished from the reasons why they are good or bad, true or false. Authority needs certification. That is why the inerrancy of Scripture is necessary to the infallibility of Church or Pope.[6] For the Church cannot guarantee the inerrancy either of itself or of the truth it teaches unless it can produce credentials that it is Divinely guaranteed from possibility of error; and that is not possible.

But as Christianity is a historical religion, deriving its distinctive features from the life and teaching of a historic Person, the individual must needs acquire his first knowledge of it from authority, whether the authority be a modern teacher or a written record; and as Christian faith and life have from the first been embodied in and transmitted by a Society, it comes to all of us as essentially a social product. It is received and recognized, and it is a living, growing thing. As at the first, so much more now, it embodies a rich and varied experience embracing far more than the individual, with his special aptitudes and limitations, can extract out of it. Further, every society which is to survive must retain its inalienable right to safeguard the foundations of its own life and existence; and it is eminently reasonable to claim that nineteen centuries have revealed that Christianity enshrines truths and values which must be safeguarded, and too precious to be lightly risked or abandoned. Viewed in

[6] That the Church decided the limits of the Canon of Scripture (as Canon Lilley points out in his *Religion and Revelation*) is historically true, but theologically beside the point. The Church *recognized* the inspiration of certain writings and accepted them as of Divine origin, but she did not claim to be the *source* of that inspiration and authority. The Church was 'a witness and keeper of Holy Writ,' and her power of interpreting it was limited to the task of preserving its true meaning: she claimed no power to decree anything which is contrary thereto. The type of modern apologetic which affects to treat radically destructive criticism of the New Testament as unimportant, on the ground that we still have the living voice of the Church which gave us the New Testament, is compounded of novelty and futility.

this way the authority of the Christian tradition embodied in the Christian society is not essentially different from other tested knowledge and experience. Even our belief in an ordered objective world is a social product, pragmatically verified. Reason and conscience are not merely private faculties and possessions: we can trust them because they are the embodiment of what is much more than merely individual.

There is, then, no necessary opposition between the authority of the Christian society and the claims of sound learning and of individual insight. Authority may be the means of attainment to the true freedom of truth in contrast to the licence of error. And it is not possible to be a living member of a living society and at the same time to do exactly as you like. Frequent tension between authority, learning, and individual inspiration is inevitable in the world as it is if there is to be any progress at all. For not all that claims to be sound learning is so, nor are all claimants to individual inspiration either good or wise. But though tension is inevitable, it should be temporary if the true nature, function and justification of authority are perceived. The first necessity is to put away the illusion that authority is inerrant, and the further illusion that it is untrustworthy if it is not. Whatever the 'given' elements, whether in ordinary experience or in a religious revelation, they can never be wholly isolated from other human elements involved in their reception and assimilation. Nor can there be any sharp distinction between the revelation of God in Christ, of which the Church is the trustee, and any other knowledge of God which may be reached by individual insight or from study of God's world: the human receptivity of the one, no less than the human activities in the others, involve imperfection and the possibility of error. It is because God cannot give faith in and knowledge of Himself *to persons*, otherwise than by personal conviction involving human receptivity and mediation, that any form of mediation, whether of Christ or of the authority of the Church, is necessary. Were it otherwise, all forms of mediation would be alike superfluous and gratuitous sources of misunderstanding.

If the essence of the Christian revelation is the restoration and promotion of personal relations of sons to their Divine Father, the main purpose of God's self-revelation, and therefore

of the authority of the Church which derives therefrom, is not to fill the gaps in intellectual knowledge or to resolve mysteries, but to open our eyes to understand God's manifestation of Himself everywhere. That is why faith is both a Divine gift *and* our own insight. To think of it as only the one or only the other is to sunder what God has joined together.

The Lambeth Conference Committee responsible for the Report on the Christian Doctrine of God made statements very relevant to the nature of the authority of the Church.[7] It is stated that God is both the transcendent Author of the cosmic process, yet immanent in it and not separate from the life of man.[8] The vastly increased knowledge of the universe characteristic of our age is described as 'this revelation, for such it truly is.'[9] And again:

> 'Man has been made in the image of God, and we discern that man's nature is such that there is some ground of union between God and him . . . and in the highest ideals which the human conscience recognizes there is a revelation of the ideals present to the Divine Mind.'[10]

The bearing of these statements on much that is still taught among us 'on the authority of the Church' cannot be ignored. We cannot conceive that God directly implants notions destined to be found ethically and otherwise defective by man; and that is what has happened to not a little for which the authority of Divine revelation has been claimed. The frequent modern insistence that Christianity is not concerned to teach science and history would have been more impressive had it been made before scientific and historical propositions which the Church had authoritatively taught had been proved erroneous. There can be no doubt that in religious, as in all other knowledge, human progress has proceeded through what, from the standpoint of later advance, is to be described as error. The admissions made by this Committee, together with the infant though growing science of the processes by which all human formulated knowledge is attained, will create difficulties for the traditional ideas of revelation, and of authority derived therefrom, greater than

[7] The Conference as a whole takes responsibility only for the Conference Resolutions, and not for the reports of its Committees; but one of the Resolutions specially commends this Report.

[8] Report, p. 67. [9] Report, p. 66. [10] Report, p. 67.

any which have hitherto been encountered; and equal difficulties for the popular appeal to religious experience as though it were an *independent* source of knowledge.

Unless it be contended that man can wrest the knowledge of God from Him against His will, all true knowledge of God must be His self-revelation. But it is no longer possible to distinguish revelation from 'natural knowledge' by its *modus operandi*. Nor can any idea be known to be true in a vacuum: its meaning and its very being are determined by a system of ideas. A doctrine may define a fact as it appears within a certain sphere of thought, but, as Whitehead says,

> 'You cannot claim absolute finality for a dogma without claiming a commensurate finality for the sphere of thought in which it arose.' [11]

Dogmas may be adequate in their adjustment of certain conceptions, 'but the estimate of the status of those concepts remains for determination.' There is no knowledge which can prove that religion is not evoked by the action of an invisible Reality upon human souls; and certainly the knowledge most valued by religious men was not in fact achieved by any conscious process of ratiocination. But religious experience is always clothed in forms supplied by other human knowledge and experience of the world. Intense experience precedes elaborate theological formulation; but there is no *bare* experience which comes first, apart from all ideas already entertained. Religious experience and theology, or ideology, are always inter-related, however rudimentary the theology may be or however little the experient may be aware of it or attend to it. The two always interact and grow together: religious experience can never be isolated from ideas or from theology.

These considerations must determine the relations of the Church's authority to sound learning. The authority of the past cannot be invoked to settle problems which increased knowledge will always present. Even universal agreement in the past upon matters which were not then the problems they have since become, or which were then seen in a very different setting, can as well betoken universal error as universal truth.[12] The great-

[11] *Religion in the Making*, p. 130.

[12] It is this fact which makes it so difficult to attach to the agreement of 'the undivided Church' the overwhelming weight assigned to it in the admirable treatment of Authority by Prof. N. P. Williams, in *Northern Catholicism*.

est danger to the authority of the Church is the growth of a mentality which thinks that modern questionings can be silenced by the search for and the application of past authoritative precedents. This mentality is a progressive disease, for it inevitably regards the inability to share it as a further revolt against authority and as additional evidence of the need of it. It is equally unnecessary and disastrous to appeal to authority to rule out new ideas on the ground that, if they are admitted, then there was no Divine guidance of the Church in the past, or that the Holy Spirit led the Church astray. For, whatever may be 'given' to men, what they can appreciate and understand is always determined by their insight, their goodness and their knowledge. The question is not whether the Divine guidance has enabled the Church to anticipate modern problems, but only whether, in the light of the knowledge available at the time, the Church definitely took the wrong line. If we can judge that in a given context she acted for the best, the fact that the identical decision would not now be the best, or even that it would now be wrong, is no proof of the absence of Divine guidance in the past. Inasmuch as the source of the Christian revelation is a Person, whose work is continued by his Spirit, there can be a 'perpetually fresh response to the unchanging Lord in ever-changing conditions.'[13] New circumstances with no counterparts in the first age of Christianity or in past ages of the Church's life demand new decisions. The Church's authority will be real and weighty in so far as it represents a consensus which is really free. The agreement of vast multitudes of Christians is of very little weight so long as they are forbidden, on pain of eternal loss, to entertain even interior doubt of any elements in a defined body of dogma.

Though the various attempts to establish external authority of an inerrant kind have all failed, societies have the right to preserve the basis of their life, and certain people must be charged with that responsibility. They may thus legitimately exercise authority; but sooner or later they must come to terms with established knowledge, otherwise they will be using even truth itself to encourage falsehood. And, as in the past, so no doubt in the future, it will often be the part of individual re-

[13] W. Temple, *Thoughts on Some Problems of the Day*, p. 31.

formers to rouse authority from indifference and to open its eyes. Spiritual insight, whether of the Church or of the individual, has no special qualifications to pronounce upon issues which are questions of evidence; and the only spiritual life worthy of the God whom men worship, or of man himself, is that which is built upon and nourished by truth, so far as truth is available. At any stage the Church may reasonably say that new ideas or new doctrines are not yet established as true and ought not so to be presented by those who teach in her name; but she will do well to remember Prof. A. E. Taylor's words: 'If one age, from the worthiest motives, persists in defending the indefensible, the next is likely to see a panic surrender of the indispensable.'[14] The degree of submission the Church may reasonably ask will depend on circumstances; and in the last resort there is no escape from the principle that the individual must follow conscience and take the consequences. Wise authority will try to avoid creating tension between itself and conscience, and in the modern world will gain in impressiveness the more unreservedly it commits its authoritative message to the test of knowledge and experience. As the Bishop of Gloucester says with his refreshing bluntness: 'What thoughtful people are demanding from the Church of England at the present time is not greater authority, but greater intelligence.' On the other hand the individual who cannot see the relevance of a particular doctrine to the religious life, or who is persuaded that knowledge no longer permits reasonable faith to affirm it, ought to hesitate long when others no less intelligent and no less Christian think otherwise.

When all else has been said, and however true it may be, the fact is that the Church's authority in faith and morals will never be strong until the desire for active membership in the Church is strong, which means not until men are attracted to her. All the establishment and argumentative vindication of claims, and likewise the modification of them, will avail little until the Church not only expounds her ideals, but displays them. The world will never believe that the riches claimed by the Church are really in her possession until she can confront the world with a much larger measure of them realised in her own corporate life.

[14] See the excellent chapter on *Authority* in *The Faith of a Moralist*, vol. I, p. 227.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN DOCTRINE

By the Rev. Canon Creed, D.D., Ely Professor in the University of Cambridge.

IN an occasional paper, first published a quarter of a century ago, Ernst Troeltsch summed up with a pregnant phrase the change which had come over Theology in Germany in the course of the preceding half century: 'Theology,' he said, 'is no longer liberal, it is scientific.'[1] A masterly analysis of the theological history of the nineteenth century leads him to distinguish two main tendencies, both originating in the Romantic movement, which in combination impressed upon the century its distinctive theological character. In the first place there was the historical approach to Church and Bible. The Higher Criticism of the Biblical texts brought the material of Revelation within the scope of historical method, and Hebrew religion with its Christian sequel came to be viewed as a great process of history. Bible and Dogma tend to lose their absolute quality, and to appear as expressions of a progressive development. Historical theology is emancipated from traditional dogmatic. That is one, but only one, of the two great forces at work in the theological movement of the time. Alongside the critical movement is to be set the revived consciousness of the communal life of the Christian Church. The great critics of the nineteenth century adopted methods which were common to the literary and historical disciplines, but they were not allowed to forget that the literatures which they were handling held a unique position in western civilization. They were the sacred books of the Christian Church. Nor were the critics themselves for the most part indifferent to this consideration. Intellectual integrity demanded impartial investigation and untrammelled freedom, but the interest which inspired their work was not merely literary, or merely

[1] *Rückblick auf ein halbes Jahrhundert der theologischen Wissenschaft*, Gesam. Schriften II, p. 196.

historical, but, in the main, theological and religious. Schleiermacher in the first half of the century and Ritschl in the second each gave a powerful impetus to the critical movement, and they were both primarily theologians—dogmatic theologians with a definite conception of the nature of the Christian religion and the function of the Christian Church. Of Ferdinand Christian Baur it can scarcely be said in the same sense that he was a dogmatic theologian, yet the Tubingen school was definitely a school of Christian theology, and its criticism was associated with a distinctive philosophy of the Christian religion. On the whole it is true to say that in the nineteenth century criticism and theology in the proper sense went hand in hand, critical conclusions providing material for theological use, and the theological interest stimulating and inspiring critical research.

Within the churches the main theological movement of the century was never dominant. Not only was it faced with an immense weight of *inertia*, but in Germany and England alike it aroused a vigorous opposition. A hundred years ago the revived Lutheran Confessional Orthodoxy entered upon the scene with no less startling and dramatic effect than the contemporary Tractarian movement in Oxford. Like the Tractarians, this school was profoundly antagonistic to the Liberal tendencies of the age, and, with Pusey, it regarded the critical movement in theology as a perverse and sacriligious effort 'to pull to pieces what has been received for thousands of years.'[2] Yet even here it is relevant to observe that Liberals and Traditionalists alike were handling the same material, and on both sides there was a consciousness that the issues had a direct bearing on contemporary religious faith. Now when Troeltsch spoke of German theology as he knew it at the opening of the present century, as being no longer 'liberal' but 'scientific,' he is not to be understood to imply that liberal theology had been unscientific: his fundamental meaning is that the historico-critical theology of his day was losing contact with, and interest in, the actual issues of contemporary Church life; and with a touch of apprehension he notes that the two main currents of nineteenth

[2] *Evidence upon the recommendations of Her Majesty's Commissioners for enquiry into the State of the University of Oxford.* Dr. Pusey, p. 24. *cf.* M. Pattison, *Essays*, Vol. II, pp. 213*f*.

century theology were drifting apart. Troeltsch himself had started as an adherent of the Ritschlian school. Ritschl had been first and foremost a theologian, concerned to assert the religious value of Jesus Christ, acknowledged as Lord within the Christian Church. For him the Christian faith stood alone over against every other world-view. History seemed to help him in the essential task of disentangling the Christian faith from its philosophical integument and securing the religious values of the New Testament, while discarding the doubtful aid of a philosophical world-view. Apostolic Christianity, as yet untainted by Greek speculation, provided the *data* of a true Christian theology. The commanding figure of Von Harnack is the ripe product of the Ritschlian movement, at once a conscientious and profound historian, and a Christian theological teacher, concerned to direct his age to the fundamental verity of the Gospel. But Harnack, as Troeltsch saw the position, led his pupils towards a position which he himself was unable and unwilling to adopt, *viz.* a merging of Biblical history in the general process of the history of religion. The Ritschlian appealed to the historical figure of Jesus Christ and the apostolic proclamation of his person. But the historical is ever the relative and the conditioned. Could the Christian religion maintain its identity in isolation over against the world? Was it not at every stage conditioned by its environment, heathen as well as Jewish? May not heathen mystery cults have infected, not only the language, but the thought of the great Apostle himself? And does not the dominant category of the Kingdom of God, under closer inspection and cool analysis, appear to be bound up with a strange and unpalatable Jewish eschatology, alien from modern ideas, but explicable from the historical environment of the early believers and of the Lord Himself? Thus when the bands imposed upon it by the canon-makers are relaxed, the Bible has seemed to lose its cohesion and to be drawn into the larger stream of the general history of religion. How far this process of disintegration has been thought to go may be illustrated by a quotation from the first volume of that great work, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, which has just been brought to a triumphant close: 'The claim of Christianity,' wrote the editors thirteen years ago, 'to be a "faith once delivered to the Saints" cannot bear the scrutiny of

the historian of religions. To him it appears, not a single religion, but a complex of many, justified in claiming the name of Christianity by reason of the thread of historic continuity which runs through and connects its component parts. That *quod semper quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* can supply the answer to *What is Christianity?* is a vain conceit: its strict application would leave us without Church, without worship, and without creed. For like all religions, when studied critically, Christianity is a process, not a result.'[3] That was the kind of approach to Christianity which many scholars of distinction were already tending to adopt when Troeltsch wrote that paper, from which I have quoted, in 1908, and which he had in mind when he spoke of theology as being 'scientific' rather than 'liberal.'

Shortly before the publication of *Essays and Reviews* Jowett wrote to Stanley: 'The object is to say what we think within the limits of the Church of England. We do not wish to do anything rash or irritating to the public or the University, but we are determined not to submit to this abominable system of terrorism which prevents the statement of the plainest facts and makes true theology or theological education impossible.' That is to say, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and the *Record* notwithstanding, we *will* have our say in the Church of England. I imagine that Dr. Kirsopp Lake seldom considers whether he is speaking within or without the Anglican Communion, and, so far as the ecclesiastical world is concerned, neglect rather than censure is likely to be his portion.

II.

When we turn from the schools of historical theology to the Churches, we find a situation full of baffling paradox. To the cool student of the development of ideas, the outstanding fact is the all but complete abandonment by responsible Church leaders of the traditional basis of Christian Theology. It is very easy at the present moment to miss the meaning of what has happened, for the issues are not uppermost in men's minds. If, for instance, we take our impressions of recent history from char-

[3] *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I, p. 265.

acteristic utterances at the recent celebrations of the centenary of the Oxford Movement, I think we shall form a mental picture of recent Church history somewhat as follows : A hundred years ago a Church sunk in lethargy and threatened by the inroads of infidelity, was aroused to a sense of its high calling by the Oxford Tractarians. These men recovered for the English Church its half-forgotten heritage of the full Catholic Faith. In spite of discouragement from authority, and even persecution, the Movement went from strength to strength, penetrating and influencing the other groups in the Church of England until to-day the Catholic revival wins quasi-official recognition, and bids fair to impress its stamp upon the entire Anglican Communion. But the story might be told in another way. An Anglo-Catholic of our time looks back upon the earlier phases of the Catholic revival in the light of its more recent developments. He may be conscious that the earlier leaders differed materially from the authors of *Lux Mundi* and their successors in their attitude to the Bible. But this is usually passed over with some slight acknowledgment that the Tractarians were still unduly rigid in their treatment of the Scripture. The Anglo-Catholic of these latter days is free from these encumbrances, and is prepared to surrender with a jest the traditional belief in the inerrancy of Holy Writ. It is not essential to the Catholic Faith as he conceives it, and almost unconsciously he assumes identity between the doctrine of, let us say, *Essays Catholic and Critical* and that Catholic Faith which the Tractarians reasserted a hundred years ago. If the Tractarians are allowed to speak to us with their own voice and not with that of their modern interpreters, we receive a very different impression. The Oxford leaders felt themselves confronted with a dangerous tendency to set aside the established tradition of the centuries. Not only did they themselves in fact hold the traditional view of Inspiration, which of course was common to Evangelicals, and to many of the early Liberals with themselves; but they regarded it as a primary part of their mission to put forward an adequate defence of the belief in a divine, and therefore inerrant, revelation against the onslaught of a godless criticism, which was already destroying souls in Germany and would soon extend its ravages to England. This

important aspect of the Oxford Movement is well stated by Dr. Liddon in his *Life of Pusey*.[4]

> 'The Tractarian movement,' he writes, 'has generally been described as an attempt to effect a "High Church" revival, by reasserting those portions of the Church's teaching, which the popular "Evangelicalism" was in danger of overlooking. This indeed was its immediate and most obvious result; but the Tractarians were not ultimately concerned with the deficiencies of Evangelicalism. They were chiefly thinking of the assaults of "Liberalism" upon the institution and faith of the Church. They were convinced that the only adequate protection against such assaults was to be found in strengthening a position which Evangelicals had not thought it worth while to occupy.'

For Pusey, the real crisis of his life's work arrived with the appearance of *Essays and Reviews*. His biographer remarks :

> 'Pusey's conviction of the extreme gravity of the question at issue explains why he expressed himself throughout the whole controversy on *Essays and Reviews* with a warmth which he uniformly repressed on all other occasions.'[5]

Liddon himself, the last great Church leader in the genuine Tractarian tradition, was quite right on Tractarian principles, when he regarded *Lux Mundi* as a surrender of the pass. Anglo-Catholic scholars in our day have gone further still, and they will go further yet, but it was Bishop Gore and his colleagues who first let in Modernism. It is interesting to surmise what Dr. Pusey would make of us all to-day. I fancy he would consider the enhanced pomp of worship a poor compensation for the loss of that firm hold on revealed truth which throughout his life he laboured to maintain and to strengthen. He could scarcely not feel that the cause which he had most at heart had suffered a signal defeat; for it is not too much to say that, judged by Dr. Pusey's standards, most Anglo-Catholic scholars of to-day are apostate.

This had to be. *Lux Mundi* was a bold and well-timed stroke. It has been no mean service to religion in England that the great High Church party was enabled to emancipate itself from a position which, while it was undoubtedly integral to traditional Catholic theology, had no less certainly become untenable in modern England.

Here, however, we are more particularly concerned with another outcome of *Lux Mundi*. It may seem paradoxical that so

[4] *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, Vol. IV, pp. 1*f*.
[5] *Op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 62.

grave a breach with Church tradition should, for the time being at any rate, enhance the conception of Church authority. But so it has been. The oracular authority which the Bible tended to lose was transferred to the present visible institution. The modern High Anglican thinks of the Church visible as the extension of the Incarnation, originating in the New Testament, but perpetuating and developing the Apostolic message within its own corporate life. We may almost say that for this school the Gospel is incarnate in the visible organization. Here is a genuine continuation of Tractarian thought, which has been actually strengthened by the abandonment of the old Tractarian theology. This modernized Tractarianism has achieved results in the constitutional life of the Church of England greater than any which the original Tractarianism attained, for this claim of the organization to a supposed spiritual authority inherent in itself was one of the forces which, while the nation was still reeling after the struggle of the War, pushed the Enabling Act through Parliament. Of course that is not the whole story. Some change had almost certainly become necessary. Moreover, the Enabling Act contains provisions which preserve the historic position of the English Church in its relation with the nation. But many influential supporters of that Measure regarded it, not without reason, as a step towards the assertion of that Divine authority which they conceived to be inherent in the visible organized Church, and especially in the body of Bishops.

I must now draw attention at some length to a particular manifestation of this general tendency which bears closely upon the subject of my paper.

In the year 1883 a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts recommended that the Judges of the Final Court of Appeal in Ecclesiastical Causes should have the power to consult the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province, or of both Provinces, and on the demand of one or more of their number should be bound so to consult them. Nothing was done. In 1906 a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline strengthened this recommendation by advising that

> 'Where, in an appeal before the final court which involves charges of heresy or breach of ritual, any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England shall be in controversy, which question is not in the opinion of the Court governed by the plain language of

> documents having the force of Acts of Parliament, and involves the doctrine or use of the Church of England proper to be applied to the facts found by the court, such questions shall be referred to an Assembly of the archbishops and bishops, who shall be entitled to call in such advice as they may think fit; and the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the archbishops and bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them shall be binding on the court for the purposes of the said appeal.'

It will be observed that in 1906 the Royal Commission proposed that the Final Court should be obliged to take the opinion of the hierarchy, and should be bound by that opinion, but only on such questions as were not, in the opinion of the Court, governed by the authoritative written standards of the Church. Again nothing was done.

In 1926 a Commission of the Church Assembly on Ecclesiastical Courts ventures to go somewhat further than this recommendation of the report of 1906. It recommends that 'where in an appeal before the final court the question arises what the doctrine, discipline or use of the Church of England is, such question shall be referred to an assembly of the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, who shall be entitled to call in such advice as they may think fit; and that the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the archbishops and bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them shall be binding on the court as to what the doctrine, discipline or use of the Church of England is. The court having taken such opinion into their consideration, together with any relevant Acts of Parliament, shall pronounce what in the particular case ought to be decided in order that justice may be done.' And that there may be no doubt that from henceforth it is the hierarchy alone which is to be held competent to give a legal interpretation of the doctrinal standards, it is expressly added that 'For the purposes of this paragraph the expression Acts of Parliament does not include the Book of Common Prayer or the Thirty-nine Articles.'

Let us take note of the consequences which would ensue if these recommendations received legal sanction. If a doctrinal issue came before the Final Court of Appeal it would at once become necessary for the Episcopate, however unwilling individual Bishops might be, to make an authoritative pronouncement on the doctrine in question, which might be of the nature of a gloss upon a clause of the Creed or upon one of the Articles

of Religion, which gloss would then become binding upon the Final Court. These recommendations I take to be high water mark of the new Anglicanism. They are, of course, in flat contradiction to the principles of historical Anglicanism. According to the practice of the Church of England, Bishops, like everybody else, are subject to the law and are bound by the legal doctrinal standards. The law is administered by the Bishops and, if necessary, interpreted by the courts. The new Anglicanism exalts the voice of the Episcopate above the law. It is for the Bishops to interpret the standards, and their interpretation is to bind the courts. The theory of the Divine authority inherent in the Episcopate could hardly be carried further.

It is interesting to speculate what might have happened to the Tractarian movement a hundred years ago if the Bishops at that time had held these immense powers in reserve. It is not necessary to speculate, for we know, what would have been the fate of Biblical critics at the time of the Colenso controversy if decision upon the legitimacy of their doings had been committed to an Episcopal tribunal.

In these proposals we have the doctrinal counterpart of that tendency which Mr. Ratcliff has traced with equal skill and justice in a notable sermon recently preached before the University of Cambridge with reference to recent changes in ecclesiastical administration.[6] Mr. Ratcliff's prophecy is sure :

> 'In the day in which the ecclesiastical officials finally establish the control which they seek, the Church of England as we have known it will cease to exist. Separated from the State, removed from the mainstream of the English tradition, it will be no longer the Church of England. It will be nothing more than a Church in England. The final victory of ecclesiastical officialdom will involve the Church of England in irreparable failure to perform the work for which it exists.'

I suppose that the members of this Union may be counted upon to a man to resist, in season and out of season, whether in the Assembly, in the country, or in Parliament, such a proposal as that of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of the Church Assembly. And we will not allow it to be said that we are bad Churchmen for so doing. On the contrary, it is we who stand in the true line of Anglican development, and who defend the ecclesiastical principles committed to us from an illustrious past.

[6] See *The Modern Churchman*, June, 1931.

III.

We seem to have travelled far from the critical history of religions with which we started. But I hope that I have already succeeded in suggesting to you the thought that that movement in theological learning and the contemporary claims of ecclesiastical authority are two complementary tendencies. Both originate in what I think a German would call the *Aufhebung* of Liberalism, and, in spite of their divergent methods, both have certain characteristics in common. The ecclesiastic who works with the idea of the inherent authority of the Church has in his mind a picture of the long story of the Christian religion. He starts from the empirical fact of the Church and its religious experience. However it came to be there, there it is, with its own inherent life, immanent in rite and sacrament. The historian of religions is at once broader and narrower in his view. As critical historian, he must not, like the Churchman, identify himself with the Christian, or with any other stream. His survey of 'religious experience' must be all embracing. On the other hand he may be narrower, because, inasmuch as he regards religion, as critic, from without, it is easier for him than it is for the Churchman to miss the concrete reality of religion. But ecclesiastic and critic in our day tend to have this in common, that they both think of religion, whether it be ecclesiastical Christianity or the whole history of religion, as a great historical process. I can even imagine the ecclesiastical apologist feeling himself confirmed by the critic in his ecclesiasticism. If, for instance, the critic tells him that Christianity is 'not a single religion,' but 'a complex of many religions,' held together by a 'thread of historical continuity,' I can think that this might seem to justify his solicitude for protecting 'the thread of continuity,' which, with a little good will, might be made to stand for episcopal succession or, if you prefer it, the Papacy. Thus the one movement may provide arguments and illustrations to the other, and they both manifest certain common characteristics, derived from the mental complexion of the time.

None the less it remains true that the two tendencies are following divergent paths. The historian of religions may notice high ecclesiastical claims as a *datum* of his science, but he will

never consciously allow them to decide his own problems. Conversely, the ecclesiastic will remark particular conclusions of critical scholarship and often show considerable ingenuity in adapting them to his own scheme, but he accepts his scheme on independent grounds.

If the Christian Church is to exercise authority in doctrine it must find a way to overcome this dualism and to establish a fresh correlation between the life of the actual Christian society and the critical study of religion. To achieve this end it requires a factor common to the two, and distinct conceptions of the functions of each. An autonomous ecclesiasticism and an autonomous critical study can never coalesce. Yet both Church and critic have a common interest, and therefore it should be possible for them to establish contact. We are driven back upon the question as to the nature of religion. This is a more fundamental subject of enquiry than the history of religion, for our interest in the nature of religion is in truth the ultimate ground of our interest in its history.

I think we should say this: living religion is always normative. It is concerned with the actual beliefs and practices of human beings and the sanctions which human beings recognise. This may seem obvious. It is none the less the case that, for different reasons, the pure critic and the thorough-going ecclesiastic are tempted to ignore this fundamental aspect, which nevertheless affords the only possible meeting ground common to the two. We may add that the critical study of religions will not encourage us to remain satisfied with a general and therefore abstract definition of religion. Religion actually exists only in specific forms. Christianity is a distinctive and, it must be affirmed, a 'single' religion, representing a certain type of relationship between God, man and the world which has received classical expression in the New Testament Scriptures. The authority of the Christian Church in doctrine will be vindicated in so far as we are able to maintain the Christian norm of belief with regard to God, man and the world in relation with, or in opposition to, other attitudes. This kind of authority cannot be established by official pronouncements, which at the best can play but a subordinate rôle, and may easily do more harm than good.

We should distinguish the question of jurisdiction in matters of doctrine from the question of authority in doctrine. We are obliged to acknowledge that a matter of doctrine may rightly become the subject of a legal decision. There is no absolute answer as to who is the proper authority to speak last in such cases when they arise. We Anglicans have our own historical tradition in this matter, and, on the whole, it has served us well. No one can fairly claim that the authority of the Crown in England has been used to obstruct the interests of the Church over which the King is Supreme Governor. On the contrary it has in the past protected the interests of minorities within the national Church, whose importance has been out of all proportion to their numbers, and it has secured the Church from party domination. It fulfils that function still.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH IN ETHICS

By the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, M.A., Rural Dean of Sutton Coldfield.

DR. Rashdall in the opening section of the memorandum which he submitted to *The Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes* expressed with his usual lucidity the relationship which exists between Christianity and Ethics. Christians, he said, rightly attribute to the teaching of Jesus a unique authority; but, in the last resort, this authority is based upon the appeal which His teaching makes to the moral and religious consciousness of men. If this be so, *a fortiori* the basis of the authority of the Church in the sphere of Ethics must be of the same kind. It is effective and legitimate so far, and only so far, as it is capable of evoking from the souls of men the same kind of response as that called forth by the teaching of Jesus. We do not believe that the teaching of Jesus was true because He was the teacher. On the contrary, we believe in Jesus because we judge that He taught truth. It is therefore impossible for us to accept the authority of the Church, which is secondary and derivative, on the *ipse dixit* of the Church. When the Church has spoken the matter is by no means finished. It may barely be begun. Submission to ecclesiastical absolutism, in ethical as in other matters, no doubt makes an appeal to the masochistic element in human nature which takes an unhealthy joy in shuddering before the *mysterium tremendum fascinans* and has found an embodiment in the present-day Teutonic Neo-Calvinism, the Hitlerism of the theological schools, delighting to bow down before the dictates of a God conceived as 'wholly other' than man. Such an attitude is not only sub-Christian; it is essentially unethical. It takes us right back to the primitive and unethical legend of the Fall of Man. After all, Eve could not make any moral choice between the fruit of one tree and that of another unless she had the capacity to perceive an intrinsic moral difference between the various species of fruit. Morality is something much more intimate to human nature than servile obedience to

external authority, whether that authority be the authority of the Church or even the authority of the Hebrew Jehovah Himself.

The teaching of Jesus was ethical through and through. It is therefore not derogatory to describe the Church as an ethical society; though, I hasten to add, it is not a *mere* ethical society. Our Lord was not a comet emerging from an unfathomable abyss, shedding on this world an alien light. He was that light which lighteth every man coming into the world. The Christian believes that this light is the Light of God. He believes that the lights of goodness, truth and beauty are not will o' the wisps which lead him nowhither. They may, so far as the individual is concerned, be dim and flickering; but they point him to the ultimate Light, the Father of lights with Whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning, to Him Whom Nicolas of Cusa called *Valor valorum*. Thus, for the Christian, religion and morality form an organic unity. It is a primary function of the Church to give expression, in its corporate worship, to this unity, a unity in which, I would add, truth and beauty hold a place by no means subordinate. But, at the same time, the Church possesses no supernatural communal sense which gives it the right to override our moral intuitions. It is a plain fact that the Church has repeatedly been guilty of immoral actions, as in the days when it possessed the power to persecute, and has been one of the most relentless enemies of the search after truth. In general the Church, often after long delay, follows the great ethical pioneers. It is they who are the leaders in the ethical sphere, and the ascription to the Church of an ethical authority commensurate with theirs cannot fail to prejudice ethical progress.

In the memorandum to which I have referred, Dr. Rashdall pointed out that 'one of the chief claims of Christianity to the position of a universal religion is just the fact that its Founder confined Himself almost entirely to laying down principles of the broadest possible character.' But these principles could not be left to exist in a vacuum. At first, when believers expected that the end of all things was at hand, it might suffice to proclaim uncompromisingly the absolute standards laid down by Jesus. Later, when the apocalyptic hope had lost its immediate significance, it became necessary to apply them to the conditions of

life as they are; and, as soon as men began to attempt this task, they found that the material which they must needs handle was singularly intractable. Troeltsch has familiarized us with the distinction between the Church-type and the Sect-type. The existence of the Church-type is justified by the need of a practical application of the principles of Christianity to the reform of civilization, a task for which the Sect-type is unfitted by reason of its inability so far to modify principles in their application as to bring them within the bounds of practicability. In an imperfect world each type is necessary and each has its proper function. Generally speaking ethical initiative comes from the Sect-type. It is the work of the Church-type to apply and develop, and during the process there is inevitably a degree of compromise which the Sect-type finds repugnant. The two types, though easily distinguishable, do not exist in water-tight compartments. The Church-type corresponds to ecclesiasticism, but, though the reformer is in general of the Sect-type, many great ecclesiastics have been reformers. It is disastrous when between the two types there is an absolute divorce. The tragedy of the Middle Ages was that the Church was so powerfully organized that ecclesiasticism was able to dominate, domesticate and too often to emasculate movements of the Sect-type. This is what will always happen if the authority of the organized Church is allowed to become so dominant that it is impatient of challenge.

An instructive example of the manner in which the Church exercised its authority in matters ethical is provided by the long story of its attitude towards slavery, an institution clearly inconsistent with Christian principles. In the days of primitive Christianity there was no question of either reforming or abolishing human institutions. 'The Lord is at hand!' That was enough. But when the apocalyptic hope had faded away and the Church had attained a position in which it could start out on its age-long mission of Christianizing civilization it was faced by a civilization which was so based on slavery that it would seem that, if slavery were abolished, there would be no civilization left to Christianize. Here and there voices were raised against slavery as in itself an evil thing, but the Church definitely regarded slave-owning as compatible with Christianity. So far did tolerance eventually go that a Church Synod was content to pre-

scribe as the penalty imposed on a Christian mistress who beat a slave-girl to death excommunication for seven years if the homicide were intentional, mitigated to excommunication for five years only if it were unintentional. If we regard the Church in the aspect of a Society for the Protection of Female Slaves, the penalty is not very impressive. It suggests not only a tolerance of slavery, but also a tolerance of some of its worst abuses. In the Middle Ages, when slavery had been replaced by serfdom, the monasteries were large owners of serfs, and S. Thomas Aquinas, the most authoritative spokesman of the mediaeval Church, defended the institution of slavery on moral as well as on economic grounds. When we come to modern times, to the recrudescence of slavery in its most iniquitous form, we find that the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade throughout the British Empire owed little to the Church of England. That this was not due to any special defect in the Church of England is suggested by the fact that the Roman Catholic Church, as Cardinal Manning regretfully admitted, played no substantial part in the anti-slavery campaign.

The driving power behind the anti-slavery movement came definitely from bodies of the Sect-type, from the Quakers, the most unecclesiastical of religious bodies, and the Clapham Sect, for instance. On the whole the attitude of the Church of England was so markedly conservative that an anonymous Country Gentleman, in a pamphlet explaining his reasons for voting against one of Wilberforce's Parliamentary Bills, could plead that 'the heads of the Church of England have either directly admitted it [*i.e.* the slave trade], or tacitly allowed it, in several instances, as well in as out of Parliament.' In vain did Bishop Beilby Porteus seek to stir up the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, which was a slave-owning body, to a realization of the influence it might exert on other plantation owners by its example in its dealings with its own slaves. His *Essay towards a Plan for the more effectual Civilization and Conversion of the Negroe Slaves on the Trust Estate in the Barbadoes, belonging to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, aroused strong opposition, and after consideration by a Special Committee the proposals contained therein were rejected. Bishop Warburton of Gloucester had also honourably distinguished himself by the

stand he had taken against the institution of slavery, and he also had, in a sermon before the Society, striven to bring his influence to bear on the *S.P.G.*

But one of his successors, Bishop Hallifax, took a different line. I think that it is worth while to consider a pronouncement which he made on the question of slavery, not so much because of its merits or demerits, but because it illustrates in an extreme form some of the elements in the position taken by ecclesiasticism when it is faced by a problem of progressive ethics.

> 'That the spirit of the Gospel is favourable to domestic as well as to civil and religious liberty,' he said in 1789, 'no sober believer will deny; but that Christianity and Slavery are incompatible, and cannot subsist together, is more than the authority of Scripture will warrant us to affirm . . . Though it be true in theory that the mild temper of Christianity is little suited to domestic Slavery, and though it be true in fact, that in proportion as Christianity prevailed, Slavery has declined; though the laws, by which the practice is now regulated in the West India islands, be confessedly framed more with a view of consulting the advantage of the master than the happiness of the slave, and, on that account, may, many of them require to be amended or repealed; yet, till such amendment or repeal be actually obtained, the permitting of Slavery in Christian kingdoms is not repugnant to the precepts of holy Scripture; and to represent it as such to a deluded public, is injuring the cause we mean to serve by an imprudent manner of defending it, and is both inpolitic and unjust.'

There is little enough here of the fiery zeal of the Sect-type! But at the same time within the cautious and carefully balanced statement there is enshrined the Christian principle which was so soon to be fatal to the institution of slavery. When we say that the Church is conservative we ought to remember that it is conservative in the sense that it conserves values and ideals with which the prevailing conditions of social organization may for long ages be out of harmony. The ecclesiastical body may not be fitted to make the spectacular advance which comes when the time is ripe. That usually is the work of the pioneer; but the pioneer owes more than he is aware to the Church which in the past has preserved, under conditions often adverse, the principles which provide the mainspring of his action.

In other words, the Church fulfils within the sphere of ethics the same kind of function as an Academy fulfils within the sphere of art or letters. It also suffers from the same kind of defects. The Progressive is usually impatient of Academies, at any rate until he himself becomes an Academician. One of the defects

of an Academy is that it always tends to arrogate to itself an excessive authority, a tendency which is intensified in ecclesiastical bodies by the belief or hope or assumption that they are in some special sense organs of the Holy Spirit. I am not exaggerating. It is not many years since one eminent ecclesiastic on his elevation to the office which he now holds was reported to have said publicly, 'I try to remember that he who holds this office must be much more than an ecclesiastic or a personage in the public life of the country. He must be the chief spokesman of God to his fellow-countrymen.'

The Academy sets much store on the past. Its appeal is ever to tradition and precedent. We note how Bishop Hallifax, even while admitting that the spirit of the Gospel was unfavourable to slavery in any form, based himself ultimately on the authority of Scripture. He appealed from the spirit to the letter. Another Bishop of Gloucester, the present distinguished occupant of the See, has recently made an even more startling appeal to the letter of Scripture when, dealing with the Matthean exception to the Lord's principle of the indissolubility of marriage, though he admits that it may be a later gloss, he writes, 'We have no means of deciding whether this be part of our Lord's words or a later gloss. We may assume that it would not be allowed to be part of the text of the Bible except for our guidance.'

Another characteristic of ecclesiasticism is well exemplified in Bishop Hallifax's pronouncement on the anti-slavery campaign — a cautious allowance for the conditions of the times. In the light of subsequent events we may consider that his caution was excessive; but it is easy to be wise after the event. The ecclesiastical mind is bound to consider carefully what is and what is not possible under the conditions of society as they are. It is well, however, that the ethical reformer, with his lesser responsibility, should advance further than the point which ecclesiastical authority would authorize.

Advance there must be, for vital ethics can never be static. With changing conditions traditional rules break down and Christian principles demand a new application. As men gain new powers, new responsibilities are thereby imposed on them. A growing sensitiveness of conscience raises issues of which our fathers were unaware and constitutes a challenge to which we

must respond. Dr. Hensley Henson, the present Bishop of Durham, when Canon of Westminster, in a lecture delivered in Westminster Abbey, even went so far as to say, 'The Christian Church must henceforth reckon with a greater moral authority than its own, an authority indeed largely of its own creation, the authority of the general conscience.'

The need of a progressive ethic is exemplified by the new position in which parents are placed by the power they now possess of controlling the number in their families and spacing births. A new responsibility has been placed on them. Conditions also have been changed; for improved sanitation, the advance in medical knowledge, and the development of philanthropic activities have neutralized the effects of pestilence and disease as a check on the growth of population. The general conscience has increasingly justified the employment of the new methods of regulating man's natural increase. So far as the Lambeth Conference may be considered authoritative the pronouncements of Church authority in this matter are instructive and definitely progressive. In 1908 the Academicians of Lambeth, true to Academical form, regarded with alarm the growing practice of the artificial restriction of the family and earnestly called upon all Christian people to discountenance the use of all artificial means of restriction. The call fell on deaf ears. The Lambeth Conference, it may be, had not reckoned with what Dr. Henson described as a greater authority than that of the Church, the authority of the general conscience. But by 1930 a significant change had taken place, for in that year the Conference by a majority of nearly three to one, though hedging its statement round with a number of cautious reservations, pronounced that the limitation or avoidance of parenthood might be a clearly-felt moral obligation, and that where this is so and there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence, other methods may be used. This is excellent so far as it goes, but the conscience of humane people is unlikely to rest content with the enunciation of general principles, for it is becoming increasingly sensitive to the mass of misery which is attributable to uncontrolled breeding, in the form of ruined home-life, miserable childhood and the wretchedness and fear of multitudes of women. By the side of his own moral judgment the authoritative pro-

nouncements of the Church, however excellent, count little, one way or another, with the modern man of high principle. No one who has read Mr. Claud Mullins' recent book, *Marriage, Children, and God*, can fail to be impressed by the abundant evidence it provides of the deplorable results, in certain circumstances, of ignorance of the methods of birth-control or of neglect to use them. The book is profoundly Christian in spirit, and it is motivated by a deep pity and a wide sympathy. It is high time that those who are most in need should receive guidance and information in this matter. The change in tone and in substance between the Lambeth pronouncements of 1908 and 1930 was satisfactory enough so far as it went; but in this matter we are no more likely to-day to receive an effective authoritative lead from any official ecclesiastical body than were the men who a century ago fought for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade.

An ethical question on which the authority of the Church is in imminent danger of coming into conflict with the general conscience is the question of marriage and divorce. As the Bishop of Liverpool has recently pointed out, if Christians regard as guilty of a moral offence a woman who, after being deeply wronged by a worthless husband, seeks the relief of a divorce and marries again, we need not wonder if high-minded people both within and without the Church hesitate to accept the Christian judgment on any moral question. At the last Lambeth Conference the bishops came perilously near to this when they suggested that the clergy might repudiate their legal duty to solemnize the re-marriage of the innocent party in a divorce case, and should even treat such a one, when re-married under civil sanction, as excommunicate until the case has been referred to the bishop who, in his turn, should act subject to provincial regulations. There is no logical reason why such regulations should be envisaged unless there be a suggestion that the party concerned is to some extent guilty of a moral offence. There is also no doubt that, as the Bishop of Liverpool suggests, high-minded people both within and without the Church would repudiate any such judgment. When such people are convinced that the ecclesiastical judgment is misguided there will be an end to the effective authority of the Church on questions of ethics.

It is notorious that the Church generally has resisted efforts to secure an extension of the admitted grounds for divorce. It is not that the Church takes a high view of the state of matrimony and the reformers a low one, for the demand for reform comes mainly from those who esteem the relationship between man and wife as so sacred that they detest the attempt to maintain by force of law a simulacrum of the real thing when in truth the soul is dead. The Church, albeit somewhat reluctantly, admits the right to divorce and re-marriage after adultery. Is it consistent with reason or morality to deny that the marriage relationship may be shattered quite as irretrievably by other causes, by the incurable insanity of one of the parties for instance? Such a position seems to imply a disproportionate stress on the physical aspect of marriage.

The ecclesiastical attitude towards the divorce question is determined by two considerations. The social risks involved in the extension of the grounds of divorce are real, and it is the duty of the Church, which by its nature is a conservative body, to approach the question with the utmost caution. This consideration is fortified by the incorrigible ecclesiastical instinct to look for precedent, especially written precedent, when confronted by any new ethical problem. Nor may we leave out of account the influence of an Anglo-Catholicism which is nervously anxious to keep in step with Roman Catholic practice. The written text to which the Church appeals in this matter is of course to be found in the Gospel reports of our Lord's utterances about marriage and divorce. I will not attempt to deal with the various interpretations which have been placed on these passages or with the complicated critical questions to which they give rise, nor will I dwell on the tangled story of the subterfuges by which the Church has sought in the past to evade the results which follow from treating our Lord's sayings as if they were articles in a legal code. It is unnecessary to do so if we believe that His mission was not to legislate, but rather to set up a standard of values the authority of which is ultimately based on the response it elicits from our deepest moral intuitions. It is, however, necessary to assert as strongly as possible the danger to the authority of the Church in matters of ethics if it is led by its innate conservatism, its hankering after precedent, to persist in an obstructive

attitude towards a demand for reform of the law of divorce so far as that demand is an expression of the moral conscience at its highest.

Another illustration of the need of a progressive ethic is provided by the emergence of the problems raised by our comparatively new knowledge of the laws which govern heredity. Here knowledge is power, and with growing knowledge will come a growing power by sterilization of stocks which are clearly rotten, by segregation, and by voluntary renunciation of the production of offspring to raise the quality of succeeding generations. The responsibility is the greater because the result of philanthropic work which we and our fathers have undertaken is the preservation of bad stocks which otherwise would have tended to die out. We have not as yet sufficient knowledge to enable us to dogmatize as to what can be done and what ought to be done. But it is already clear that the authority of the Church will be tested in a future, which perhaps is not far distant, by its attitude to the already emergent eugenic conscience. This is the kind of thing which really matters. By the side of this kind of thing the apparently strong ecclesiastical interest in such matters as the proposal to introduce the practice of Unction of the Sick strikes the seriously-minded as frivolous and even shocking.

The ethical authority of the Church can only be effective so far as it elicits a response from the best that is in men. It is doubtful whether the authority of the Church has been really strengthened when the Church has assumed the rôle of moral policeman. It was driven to do so during the period of the Dark Ages, and the result was the legalism of the Penitential system, a system remarkably alien from the Spirit of Christ. In the words of Bishop Stubbs, the Penitential 'was in reality a list of sins and their penances; sins so ticketed and valued as to please even the most abstract philosopher; permutated and combined to mathematical precision.' The Church continued to maintain the same rôle throughout the Middle Ages; but, as Mr. Coulton has conclusively shown, the moral level of the peoples who were subject to the ecclesiastical discipline of the Middle Ages was at least no higher than that prevalent in more modern times after the Church had been deprived of its power of coercion. The only Church which is in a position to-day to wield an effective dis-

cipline of spiritual coercion is the Roman Catholic Church. Criminal statistics, so far as they provide a fair criterion, do not indicate that the effects of Roman Catholic discipline are very satisfactory. As no official statistics of the religious persuasion of criminals in England have been published since 1906 we are driven to turn elsewhere. Such statistics are published in New Zealand, and from them we gather that in 1930, of the Anglican population of that country one in four hundred and sixty enjoyed the hospitality of His Majesty's prisons, whereas for the Roman Catholics the proportion was one in one hundred and ninty-five. In other words, the proportion of criminals among the Roman Catholics was nearly two and a half times as great as that among the Anglicans who were free from the kind of ecclesiastical discipline to which their Romanist fellow-countrymen were subject.

It is nevertheless the fashion to-day in Anglican ecclesiastical circles to advocate the assertion of the authority of the Church by means of the imposition of a stricter discipline in the shape of excommunication. The flaw here is that, though some would be excluded from Holy Communion, many of those who were morally and spiritually the most undesirable of Communicants would be admitted freely if they wished to come, for none of the disciplinary schemes which are propounded would exclude the mean-spirited and the hard-hearted. Their effect would be that we should bang the door in the face of some of those who will be first in the Kingdom of Heaven while leaving it wide open to many who will be last.

A bishop can with impunity incite his clergy to break the law by refusing to solemnize the marriage of any divorced person. He can do it with safety because it is very unlikely that anyone who has passed through the agony of the shipwreck of a home followed by the ordeal of the Divorce Court will be willing to incur the further distress of the publicity involved in the assertion of his or her legal right to re-marriage in church. It is quite easy to hit a man who is down. Gestures such as this do not increase the moral authority of either priest or bishop; and moral authority is the only kind of authority which counts in the long run. The Lambeth suggestion of a temporary excommunication of the innocent party who has re-married under civil sanction, pending the decision of the bishop who must act in conformity

with provincial regulations, would have exactly the same kind of effectiveness. The poor body, who, after perhaps years of misery, is looking forward to the happiness of a new married life, is not likely to trouble about an approach to the parish priest, a reference of the case to the bishop and the application to it of provincial regulations. I do not think that many people, Churchmen or otherwise, would expect such a one to do so, and, if failure to conform to the proposed regulations resulted in a permanent excommunication, the only result would be that the authority of the Church would be exercised in a manner which rendered it odious to the general moral conscience, than which nothing could be more disastrous.

The ethical authority of the Church resides in ideals and principles which require no compulsion to make them effective, and, we believe, have their true home in the bosom of the Church. They find expression in the lives of the men and women who have drawn their spiritual nurture from the communal religious life. If the Church produces such individuals its authority will be effective through them. If it ceases to do so the authority of organization and discipline will be of little avail. Professor Whitehead, whose authority, I should imagine, exceeds to-day that of many ecclesiastical Conferences and Assemblies, is not too happy about the present position nor too confident about the future. We would do well to give what he has to say our most serious consideration.

> 'In the Middle Ages,' he says, 'institutional Christianity was honourably distinguished as a driving force towards the grander intuitions. Unfortunately, in accordance with the habits of all institutions, it adapted itself to its environment. It became an instrument of conservation instead of an instrument of progress. After a short period of progressive energy, the Reformation Churches again accepted the same idolatrous rôle. On the whole, well-established religious institutions are to be reckoned among the conservative forces of society. They soon become the grand support of what Clement had called "communal custom." But the ultimate ideals of which they profess themselves the guardians, are a standing criticism of current practice.'

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN ECONOMIC, INDUSTRIAL, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS

By the Rev. M. T. Dunlop, B.A., Tutor of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

I.

(1)

HAS the Church any authority and function in the political, economic and social organization, and if it has, what are its authority and function? No problem of the Christian life more readily attracts interest nor more quickly exhausts it. Youth sees this question as of urgent importance, and for many young men and women of active minds and ideals a Gospel is a political and economic programme. Yet middle age is indifferent, and old age often dismisses the question with a cursory negative. The reason is plain. The question has an apparent simplicity. At first sight we say with confidence that the gospel of the Church must have an answer for social problems if it answers anything. But in truth behind our question lies a complicated congeries of closely interrelated questions each of particular difficulty. As we realize this is so, what we said with confidence we assert in despair, and later we would avoid the question altogether. This paper will attempt an answer by proceeding first to recall and examine certain of these underlying questions.

(2)

What is the Church? If it be a supernatural society able to pronounce with divine authority, what or who is its mouthpiece, and can it properly pronounce outside whatever is regarded as the religious sphere? In theory, Roman Catholics answer that it is supernatural and authoritative in every sphere; while Anglo-Catholics, in practice, with a respectful if not very reverential eye on one aspect of the English Reformation, claim the Church supernatural, but authoritative only in matters of doctrine and rite, which is to lose supernatural authority and find consolation in its ghost. If the Church be not distinctly super-

natural, but a fellowship of Christian men and women like in kind to other societies, which is the position taken in this paper, may we presume that membership will confer political and economic insight? And if we may, then how account for the fact that its members disagree on politics and economics almost as sharply as on what they believe are the essentials to their salvation? These questions are difficult enough, but perhaps would not alone cause that paralysis of interest which the subject of the paper produces more often than not in thoughtful people. A working agreement to differ might be had between the two opposing views of a Church, and while conversion by the Gospel may not immediately confer political and economic acumen, it need not be presumed, as Lord Hugh Cecil seemed to do in a recent speech to the Church Assembly, that whenever a man speaks of political and economic problems as a Christian he speaks impertinently and as a dolt. But these questions introduce others. Among them stands out that of the nature of authority itself.

I believe that we of this age have no more difficult nor more urgent task than to arrive at a statement of a proposition about authority which shall win consent sufficiently general to be effective. The tangled jungle of politics and economics wait for that axe. Further, until we have achieved some view of authority we do not know what to expect of the Church, and, since we are the Church, it is not surprising that she fails to find her voice.

Henri Bergson, in his latest book,[1] which may well prove also his greatest, does much to clear the ground. He distinguishes in authority, as it is exercised, authority political, scientific, and moral or Divine. Without pleading the weight of his name for a summary treatment of his thought, we may say political authority is sanctioned by the expediency of a society which seeks and would maintain the greatest good of its greatest number; such authority rests ultimately upon consent but may be enforced. Scientific authority depends upon the enunciation of physical laws which are found in practice to be working laws. We are coming rapidly to a new understanding of scientific laws and already hesitate to use such terms as immutable and ineluctable to describe them, but it remains that whilst we need not suppose

[1] *Les Deux Sources de la Morale et de la Religion.* Libraire Félix Alcan, Paris. 1932.

the acknowledgment of scientific law rules out the presumption of free-will, yet such laws are statements, in practice accurate enough, of the conditions under which free-will is exercised. Moral authority, which men specifically name divine, rests, ultimately, upon the sanction of the individual conscience.

Bergson most assists us by going on to show that when men speak and act with one of these kinds of authority they tend both to claim in support of their words and deeds the other two kinds and, on the strength of their peculiar authority, to venture dogmatically into the spheres where the other authorities hold sway. The State claims for its laws the immutability popularly ascribed to those of the Medes and Persians, but belonging properly, if anywhere, then to scientific laws. The State also claims a divine authority, whether the Reformation State or modern Russia, Italy and Germany, where there are strong inclinations to interpret religion as statolatry. On the strength of its own authority, the State will dictate to conscience if conscience allows it. Further illustration was the scientist's temptation, until these latter days of his conversion, to pronounce about politics and religion dogmatically. Lastly, the Church, whose especial sphere is conscience, has decked herself out with the authority of the State and committed herself to the enforcement of articles of belief and tenets of philosophy which are either the affirmations of individual hearts and minds or they are so much wind. The Church has assumed also the authority of science, claiming immutability for past codifications of morality and terrorizing her recalcitrant members by warnings of the ineluctability of the sanctions.

There is a lesson for us in Bergson's analysis. If the Church sought to exhort the world by virtue of her rightful authority she might be able to do so effectively, for she would then be relieved of the supposed necessity to dictate in politics or to enunciate with finality in the economic field. The natural failure of the Church so to dictate and enunciate has come now to involve her silence where she should speak, and it is the fear that, mistaking her *rôle*, she may even yet attempt political and economic dictation, which lies behind much of the apprehension shared by many loyal Churchmen lest she 'interfere' in the political and economic realms.

At the same time, these three heads under which authority is here regarded are not ultimate and mutually exclusive. One authority claims the support of another largely because in a real sense all authority is one. Just as political and economic, scientific and moral laws find unity in the single ground of the mind which creates them, so in experience their operations overlap and interact. Thus the State cannot seek the greatest good without guidance from the moral laws in determining what is the good; nor may the scientist plead as finally true a picture of the universe which outrages moral authority, and its presupposition of freedom, which he admits outside his laboratory as readily as another. Christian people, and especially young Christian people, may look round with anger on poverty, war and injustice, but must recollect that politics are the art of the possible and that an economic or financial deadlock cannot be done away by preaching only, however morally authoritative.

Authority as exercised is distinguishable into three aspects, yet it is one, and the interrelations make any exact statement involved and difficult; but in practice a working view is possible. The authority of the Church is moral, and her function is to preach, but so far as our examination of authority sheds light, political and economic issues are legitimate subjects for her preaching. She cannot decree, but may discuss and teach; cannot enforce, but may persuade. Above all, the individuals who constitute a Church may still as Christians seek by thought and action to solve social and economic problems.

(3)

The suggestion is frequently made that the English Church, perhaps joined by other Churches, should set up some special organ, or committee, to deal with economics and politics. It is a suggestion the more popular lately since the public and tragic failure of professional economists and politicians to treat successfully of their own business. The suggestion would be a good one did it mean that a special organization should be set up to allow Christians periodically to investigate and discuss social affairs with the hope, rather than the object, of arriving at a common mind. Indeed, such meeting together of Christians should not attempt to reach unanimity; should hear all sides; and

should proceed at most to majority resolutions of a lengthy kind chiefly to serve the purpose of informing the public of its deliberations. The value of such Church discussion to the community would be the bringing to light of much that is obscure in our economic system, and the education and perhaps the social conversion of the men who took part in it. The clergy would return to their parishes inspired and informed with the social Gospel, and the laity to their work in business or government with a clearer understanding of their Christian duty and policy.

Unfortunately the suggestion is usually more ambitious. Exact resolutions are expected of the proposed committee, and decisions of a binding character. Experts are to be heard as before a Royal Commission. The committee is to undertake, if not direct action, then at least the making of representations to the Government backed by the united Churches. In this form the suggestion is unsound. Many of those who have so signally failed when meeting in economic conferences are themselves good Christians, and are not more likely to succeed when meeting as members of a Church. But the chief objection is that in free discussion, and by the teaching and preaching that should result, the Church exhausts, and might most fruitfully exhaust, her proper authority; she has none wherewith to sanction the decisions—if any were arrived at—of the suggested committee. In economic affairs the Church has not administrative nor executive authority; it should be as clearly realised that here neither has she divine authority. The bearings, for instance, of the various monetary proposals are most important for Christian men and women and ought to be discussed by them, and in the light of their Gospel, but that they should do so is never seriously suggested just because authoritative decisions are still half-expected of them and known to be impossible of attainment or execution.

Rather than attempt the bolstering up of Church authority where it has no place, let Church people content themselves with exploration and illumination of economics from a Christian standpoint. That would result in a measure of agreement amongst themselves, and perhaps in a number of individual Christian decisions in government and business sufficient to bring into being a society more in harmony with Christian ideals. An informed public opinion such as the Church might help to create

is an essential condition for the success of economists and statesmen of good will. In the contemporary American phrase, coined for their daring and heartening experiment in social organization, society to save itself must become 'economic conscious.' It is also necessary to defeat by publicity the machinations of vested interests through their present virtual control of much of the Press and all-pervasive if intangible influence on more of it.

(4)

There remain to be distinguished within our inquiry concerning the function of the Church two other questions, each very broad and divisible into many interrelated parts. What is the place and function of religion in the world? The reply truly depends on philosophical considerations not always sufficiently realized: What is the relation of the spiritual to the physical or material, and how affects one the other, if at all? Plainly if there be supposed a dichotomy of spirit and matter, then a religious man can fulfil no religious function in the world, but must separate and withdraw from it. The other question is subsidiary: What is the Christian answer? It is by sketching an answer to the subsidiary question that we shall attempt to indicate our answer to the complex of problems raised by the major one. They who understand the relation of the spiritual to the material, of religion to the world, in one way, would rightly regard all that has been said so far as irrelevant. Any understanding of it springs from our whole philosophy, from the whole body of our faith.

(5)

Meanwhile it is worth repeating the truism that these last obvious questions are fundamental since, because of their difficulty, although their importance is at once realized when they are posed, if impatiently realized, they seldom have explicit reference in current admonitions on the social function of the Church. The questions behind this paper are indeed so complicatedly interrelated that no fixed starting-point can be discovered. We are forced, as it were, to cut in at some point arbitrarily chosen and to play the round from there. To deal with one question is to raise all the others. It is the baffling character of the subject which often produces our indifference to it. This is more dangerous to religion and life than any opinion however cocksure and

extreme. We are tempted to read with relief such dismissals of the subject as the recent *Times* editorial, which deprecated not only decision but debate upon politics and economics, or even upon such a patently moral question as gambling, by the London Diocesan Conference. Many religious writers in England and America have hastened to endorse this editorial as right and to praise it as timely. It reminded us that 'to gain afresh the nation for Christ is the real work of the Church.' But may not this work involve just such discussion as was deprecated, in order that, in a nation which is also a democracy, public opinion may be informed and resolved upon such matters as unemployment and poverty? Or is the world in fact intractable to the spirit, and was this editorial right in declaring that 'however much some members of the London Diocesan Conference may resent that feature of creation, and deem it inconsistent with "the ideal of social justice,"' yet 'if beneath a mass of secondary factors we are to look for a single ultimate cause' of poverty, and, by implication, of unemployment, 'we can find it only in the truth that human beings, so far from starting with equal equipments, vary immensely in character and capability'? It is strange to recollect that probably one out of every three fathers who read that leader had in his home an unemployed son, and that the majority of those sons will have had a University education. One is tempted to hope for unemployment amongst ecclesiastical journalists. We may hold our own view of the Gospel of Christ; have what understanding we can come by of the power of the spirit; and answer the inquiry of this paper in this way or that, but to evade the issues is wrong. The questions involved are difficult, but because they appertain to the general question of Christian behaviour, and we can be indifferent to them only by ignoring the challenge of the Gospel as it meets us, in the practical form which is its hall-mark, throughout the range of our business from day to day.

II.

(1)

The question of the relation between spiritual and material, religion and the world, the Christian answers not in terms of a philosophy, nor of a cosmogony, at any rate at first, but, if

the phrase be allowed, in terms of a person, Jesus of Nazareth. There is rightness in this; the question is first a practical one, and only later a theoretical. If a Christian would know in what light to regard the world and at what to evaluate it, let him strive to be of the character of Jesus, to catch the spirit of Jesus and make it his own. He may usefully philosophize later on the experience which will then be his. This is not a popular view with theologians to-day. In their reaction against Liberal-Protestantism they have decided that little or nothing can be known about Jesus, and that what may be discovered reveals a man very different from a modern European Christian. This reaction has gone too far, thanks to the avidity with which the irrationalists and the sceptics have taken advantage of it. In the long run it will be found that the latest instruments of New Testament criticism have prized half-open the door that thirty years ago stood newly unlocked between the written Gospels and the living accents of Jesus. A complete biography with ordered sequence of events we cannot have. As Professor Goguel puts it, 'although the personality (of Jesus) remains the most mysterious in history,' it is also, because of the genius of His teaching, 'the most transparent.'[2] And while it is wise to recognize that He was not a modern European, and so not to look in His teaching for anything like a philosophy, sociology, or code of moral laws apt for modern times, yet personality is universal and the influence of a person — it is a matter of common experience — not limited to those who share his circumstances and thought-forms. Jesus was a son of man, and His life and words are as charged with significance for us as they were for those who saw and heard Him. Before any attempt be made to determine what should be a modern Christian's attitude to the world, or what has been the attitude of Christians in the past, the Christian is right to start by studying the mind of Jesus as he finds it.

Jesus accepted the world not only more readily and fully than most of His religious contemporaries, but absolutely. He dined out; He drank wine; He had an eye for natural beauty, and His parables reveal an artist's love of things. He was

[2] *The Life of Jesus*, p. 282. English Translation by Olive Wyon. Published by Allen & Unwin, 1933.

humane. The tone of His teaching is informed and sane, gentle and yet strong, swift and ironical on occasion, the voice of acceptance and trust, the utterance of a full man dwelling in this world as his home. This fulness and sanity of mind constitute one of the reasons for the quiet acceptance by Jesus of the political and social conditions of His time. Revolt was so foolishly desperate a matter for a Jew that only a narrow fanaticism, world-despising, could inspire it. For Jesus, a powerless Galilean, life offered enough, and suicide was no duty. That is not to say that acceptance by us to-day, in our different circumstances and with our measure of political power, would not be disloyalty to Him. Running together with the world-acceptance of Jesus, and not against it, is something more. There is in Jesus as a man a nature transcendental as well as earthly, and loyalty to that nature is the demand which His example and teaching makes upon us. The world is accepted, but by the light of the transcendental, and it is by that light we must evaluate it. In truth it has no value unless so lit, and it is the man who lives merely as an animal, who, all passion spent, finds himself in a dark and alien world and he possessed of *ennui* and despair. The loyalty of Jesus to the transcendental is revealed in the perspective in which He teaches men to see the world and their many problems in it, a perspective not really dependent upon distance and detachment from it, though it may seem so, but upon an ordering according to some principle. This same loyalty is revealed in His withdrawal into Himself in desert places; in His eschatological teaching; in His decisions against comfort, safety or popularity; and in His determination to die. The world is lovely, but worldliness unlovely. 'What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' No ascetic could have said that; it implies a warm evaluation of the world foreign to asceticism. It means that in the last resort, for a principle, for truth, for beauty, for goodness, the true man counts the rewards and good opinion of the world but as dung. Troeltsch, who begins his monumental study of the social teaching of the Churches with a careful analysis of the mind of Jesus, truly remarks, 'The ethic of Jesus is heroic rather than ascetic.'

This loyalty to the transcendental is the heart of that individualism proper to religion. The traditional Christian doctrine

of election and predestination preserves the individual. Perhaps the highest value of the teaching of the natural sinfulness of man is that it distinguishes, preserves and sharpens his sense of his individuality by bringing responsibility home, not to movements or inherited tendencies, but to himself. The man must himself be found of God, must himself seek after God, and in the act is separated from his fellows and from the world.

This truth is dangerously open to the grave misunderstanding that religious conversion means a new and hostile view of the world. The experience which inspires these doctrines is not peculiar to Christians, and too often it has found expression in the Christian Church in terms alien to the mind of Jesus. When that has occurred there is found always depreciation of the historical, the rational and the aesthetic. It still finds such alien expression, as in Barthianism and, though less univocally, in the Oxford Groups, which propound the general doctrine of grace appropriate to religion as it is naturally in man rather than the specifically Christian form of that doctrine. The Christian doctrine of grace is determined by the Christian doctrine of God. The attraction of God compels the heart to respond by itself, secretly, and in that response to find its individuality, but God is to be pictured as Love and as Father. In that initial response we are to love God with all our mind and strength, and just because of the nature of the God loved, the first great commandment has a corollary, we are to love our neighbours as ourselves. They are our brethren in God the Father. Thus paradoxically the Christian in finding his individuality discovers the strength of the cords and bonds of love which bind him to his fellows; as he is personally elected of God, so is he personally committed to make his brethren his business, personally bound, with all the force of his faith, to care for the interests and welfare of society so far as he is able. The difference between us and the early Christians is the difference of our practical ability to care; we, as they, have to ask with sincerity, Who is my neighbour? And there comes to us a wider answer.

Further, the God who elects the Christian is not a contender for the world against one or more other powers; not even the supreme governor of an extraneous world; but the Creator of the world. The physical universe and the fruits of the earth; the

flesh, its instincts and appetites; the whole historical and rational process which man experiences as life, are of the God who so loved the world that the world is compelled by His love. In growing to the fulness of the Christian stature a man does not find escape from the world, but rather then alone comes fully to realize that he is native to it. Thus the call of God is a call to service of man in a world which, it is our faith, will prove malleable to our will just in so far as that is in harmony with the will of God. Hence the dominant tone of the Christian symphony is confident hope and its resolution a note of joy. The conclusion for this paper is that the Christian's vocation embraces his work in the world. He follows his work not for gain, if that mean possessing more than another, but because in his work he responds both as an individual and as a social being to his call of God. His concern with an imperfect society is not primarily political or economic, but concern to secure such a society that response to the call of God is practicable for all men. The Christian's ideal, so simple at the outset that, in a world which knows nothing of it, it may be sufficiently achieved by the Christian's fulfilment of his own vocation, as it leavens and changes society by conversion, so it develops and expands until in its ramifications it embraces the whole social organization.

If those who are content with an imperfect society because it happens to pay them are relieved by the stressing of the essentially religious character of the Christian social duty, let them also reflect that economic ends alone have never yet inspired any great revolution, but that it is the force of an ideal, such as the Christian ideal, which turns the world upside down.

(2)

We have used the word 'world' in that general sense given to it in discussions of this sort. It is a sense so wide and vague as frequently to cover confusion of thought. It is worth making a brief examination of the Christian history of the word.

The word is generally given a dramatic value that is misleading: Christians are presented as in conflict with 'the world,' or as bound 'to accept the world.' In this falsely melodramatic usage since the middle of the last century 'the world' means the material conditions of life, and covers indiscriminately the

course of the stars, nature 'red in tooth and claw,' or wages and prices. This world is conceived of as something outside us over which man, Christian or non-Christian, can have no control since it is governed by immutable laws. This is a view of the world contradicted by the Christian faith and not so confidently asserted by current science as fifty years ago. Certainly there are no immutable economic laws in the sense that there may be for the stars; rather there are generalizations upon human economic conduct, and this conduct is open to political or moral influences. So much the economists themselves are now ready to admit. Thus those who have advocated the increase of credit resources, faced by the failure of prices to rise correspondingly—a failure, in fact, probably temporary—declare that besides the existence of plentiful cash there must be 'will to spend'; and the restoration of confidence has become a first economic need although its achievement involves moral, psychological and political factors. The world as a collection of dead material, mechanical laws and uncontrollable forces, all dramaticaly arrayed against the Christian and his ideal of transformation, may be ignored as fantasy.

In medieval usage the word was associated with the flesh and the devil. Through a misunderstanding of the New Testament attitude to the world, and because of the influence of un-Christian forms of the doctrine of grace, the Christian life was conceived of as a war against the world: against the instincts, and the attractions of wealth and physical happiness. Celibacy and poverty became goods. This was probably a fortunate use in those barbarous days when Christian virtue, piety and learning required, to survive at all, the protection of monastery walls and a thorough-going negative moral code. One of our difficulties is a legacy from the scarcity and uncertainties of this time. We have to change the bases of our economic thought, hitherto occupied in conserving against dearth, and making a virtue of that necessity, so that it shall be relevant to an age of plenty. President Roosevelt, whose policy is to make the greatest possible use of nature's bounty when directed by man, yet could not refrain, in his first address to the American nation, from the customary exhortation to laborious days and a tightening of belts.

In the teaching of Jesus there is no opposition to the material and fleshly worlds. Men are called upon, in the world, to love God and the moral life, and it is not the world, vaguely and dramatically personified, which may hinder them, and in the face of which compromise is impossible, but men in their folly and sinfulness. It is men who may drive the disciple from the synagogue; force him to abandon father and mother; afford him no place to rest his head. But when for principle he endures these things, the world of earth and instinct remains. In a sense, by virtue of the disciple's disinterestedness, that world is more to him than it was; he has learnt how to woo her and, possessing nothing, he yet possesses all things. The tramp in the film, *A Nous La Liberté*, destitute but free, can lie on his back outside the mass-production factory and take pleasure in the white blossom above him against the clear sky. Christianity is not a desperate choice between religion and the world, but a call to live religiously in the world, and to co-operate with God that the world may be His temple.

In determining what was the world for the writers of the New Testament, one must allow for a measure of asceticism natural to moralists in a passionate time and place, and for the strong belief in demons and spiritual powers with its encouragement of timidity and check on any care-free attitude to life. What is amazing is how boldly the Gospel led St. Paul and his contemporaries on the one hand to jettison the law with its inhibitions —and St. Paul for one was acutely aware of the risks—and on the other to 'try the spirits.' Broadly speaking, these allowances made, the world of the New Testament is the political, economic and social situation in which Christians find themselves. The writers, with the exception of a part-author of the *Book of Revelations*, explicitly or tacitly accept this situation. They could do no other. The situation was rigidly framed within the Roman Empire, an institution so wide, yet so near, and above all so ancient and seemingly permanent, that in itself it was the world. Had a Roman been told that a Christian had decided to accept the Empire he might well have retorted, as did Carlyle when informed that a certain lady had decided to accept the universe, 'By Gad, but she had better!' Yet even the Empire is regarded from the standpoint of the one life Christians knew,

life in Christ, and a religious motive is found for political obedience. St. Paul, carried away by the momentum of his inspiration by a Gospel for man in his entirety and for the whole world, dares to see the powers of Rome as ordained by God to do His will. The logical conclusion that then those powers must conduct themselves in obedience to God as revealed in Christ is suppressed, we may suppose, by realization of the impossibility of its application, and Paul turns instead to reassert the moral commandments and that other, if there be another, Love thy neighbour as thyself. But clearly there remains in his mind the difficulty raised by embracing the pagan Empire within the Gospel, for he proceeds to remind himself and his readers that the conditions of their impotency over against the pagan world are after all temporary. Salvation is nearer to them than when they first believed and the night is far spent. With the coming of the Kingdom the Empire will cease to be.[3]

The world of men was a foreign land, and the Christian but a sojourner; on earth he had no abiding city; yet as sojourner he had a social duty. His work was part of his response to his call. Let the Christian slave be a diligent slave; the Christian master considerate; and both for Christ's sake. But production, transport and distribution; military defence, law and order, political administration; the provision of corn, meat and water, these were in the hands of non-Christians organized into an Empire as fixed as the globe, the head of which could claim to be a god without seeming ridiculous. Perhaps the Christian has an abundance of goods thus, as it were, provided for him by the non-Christian world, or perhaps a scant supply: yet his single and sufficiently arduous duty is so to use them as the mind of Christ would approve. It is, as Troeltsch has said of the social teaching of Jesus, a consumer's ethic It is the Christian social duty conveyed by the phrase, only now waning in popularity, 'The Stewardship of Wealth.'

(3)

The social interpretation in the New Testament of the religion of Jesus was appropriate to New Testament times, and that is all it was intended to be. That interpretation has been, and still is, freely referred to as authoritative for very different

[3] *Romans* xiii.

times. On the strength of it there is preached as Christian duty the quiet acceptance of imperfect social conditions. The Christian is urged to make the religious best of things as they are and is told that politics and economics are not his business. The only hope held out, and then as an aside in answer to protest, is that society will change when all its members are converted. Meantime, conversion is an independent process within society as it is, and not in itself an awakening of concern with society. The silences of the New Testament on certain aspects of the social order of its day are treated as of general significance; for example, the silence of St. Paul about slavery. There is supposed in the New Testament an indifference to the affairs of the world amounting almost to world-denial. Such misinterpretation has encouraged the melodramatic conception of the physical world as intractable, even hostile, to the spiritual; and allied with the asceticism which proceeds from religion as naturally found in man, has managed in the name of Christianity to reject the world of the flesh and its appetites. This narrow reading of the New Testament belongs to the 'literal heresy': it has been prompted by belief in verbal inspiration and is still prompted by its shade. It mistakes a particular interpretation of the Gospel, apt for the Early Church, for the Gospel itself, and in doing so misrepresents and betrays the mind of Jesus. Had St. Paul written in the fourth century, or did he write to-day, his social teaching, we may be confident, would not have been a quiescent *non possumus*.

Our present condition as Christians, differing sharply from that assumed in the New Testament, and undreamt of by its writers, demands an interpretation and application of the mind and attitude of Jesus which we shall not find in its pages. The chief differences seem to be three.

First, we live in an Empire avowedly Christian and in a world of which all but one, or perhaps two, of the important powers are also Christian. Theorizing apart, in practice the business of politics and justice, the business of production, transport and distribution, are Christian business. The conditions of life are not now regulated by a pagan organization not only beyond the influence of Christian opinion but ignorant of its existence. We are no longer to the world as the soul to the

body; but as administrators, industrialists, workmen, politicians or priests, we are the world.

Secondly, and this is a later change, the deliberate control of the world of nature and of men by men collectively for their common economic good is already within the range of possibility, has already passed from being desirable to being necessary. On the one hand, the highest affairs, whether political, economic or religious, as Lippmann emphasizes, are now public affairs; and on the other, the public must collectively control its affairs if it is to save itself from haphazard use of power by the more fortunate or more energetic few. The force of this situation in shaping social ethic, and the contrast between the circumstances of the Early Church and our own times, are readily illustrated by comparing the objective of modern Socialism and Communism with that of the so-called Communism to be found in *Acts*. The group of Christian experimenters at Jerusalem, as Troeltsch points out, shared in common their private wealths, and these were privately gained. The group was not concerned with how its members came by their wealth, if it were honestly. In contrast, the English Labour Party, in whose formation and growth much Christian idealism has been spent, stands, as does modern Russia, for a type of Communism significantly different; namely, the ownership and control by society and for society of the means of production and distribution; that is, for control, not of private wealths, but of the sources and means of wealth. Some of the opposition of Christianity to Communism arises because many Christians identify the Christian social ethic with the proper use of private wealth, and view a society which does not allow of private wealth as incompatible with the teaching of the New Testament. It is an identification most often made by those who have sufficient private wealth to be ethical about. It is even maintained by the more thoughtless that the poor must always be with us in order that the exercise of charity may continue.

The Christian is committed always as an individual to a way of life; and his very conception of his individuality, of his religious call and of his way, have always necessitated that also he should be committed as a member of a Christian society. The needs of the society have claimed his attention as urgently as

his own, and the Gospel has never been applied individually until applied collectively. The Gospel remains what it was, but the extension of its practicability, and the wider view of man's dependence on its ideals, demand new, appropriate interpretation of it. To-day the distinction between the Christian society and society at large, so real in the first century, has disappeared for the Christian conscience; and it has been the working of that conscience, from its early manifestation in the parable of the Good Samaritan, which has largely effected that disappearance.

The modern Christian outlook and aim differ from those in the New Testament in one other respect. There is in the New Testament little recognition of the dependence of the spiritual upon the material; of the dependence of a full Christian life upon economic, political and cultural conditions. This is not recognized because, to some extent, of the rigid tripartite psychology of the writers which allowed for little interplay between body, mind and spirit. To-day we would hardly use the word 'interplay,' so near are we to conceiving what these three terms stand for as aspects of a unity. Soul is changing its meaning with us and is all but synonymous with person or 'buddy.' But chiefly the New Testament has no recognition of the spiritual necessity for certain social conditions because under the circumstances in which it was written such recognition would have been merely academic. Nothing could have been done about it. That is not our situation, and it is pertinent for us to realize, with all our conscience, that an ill-fed and ill-educated slum-dweller who answers the call of God cannot rise in response to the full stature of a Christian life. Nor can many an employer conduct his business as a Christian unless the whole of his trade will do likewise, while bankruptcy is not an alternative he feels entitled to face when perhaps hundreds of others depend upon his solvency for their daily bread. The grave moral difficulties created by the present economic disorder for sincere Christian men, employers and employed, are themselves sufficient to commit the Church to care passionately about economic conditions. The moral and economic are interlocked, and what is wrong economically challenges Christians morally. As Christians we are fortunate to-day in that we are in a position usefully to realize the interlocking and to attempt correction of the wrong.

(4)

The Gospel is of wider applicability than first it was, the interrelations of the religious and the practical more manifold and perhaps subtler, but it may be doubted if the Gospel is more difficult. We have the advantage of nineteen hundred years of Christian thought and experiment. It may not be out of place to name certain modern books that help to lend us that advantage. Troeltsch's great book, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, has already been quoted, and is perhaps the most important, as it is certainly the most informative, on its subject. For the medieval period Troeltsch may be supplemented by Gierke's *Political Theories of the Middle Age*. This well displays the interdependence of religious belief, even of particular theological doctrines, and practical life, which is probably best to be realized by study of a particular form of belief operative over a definite period. Another such study, closer and more limited in range, and with an emphasis more theological, is Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Lastly, attention should be drawn to the Bampton Lectures for 1909 of Walter Hobhouse, *The Church in the World in Idea and in History*, a book which, as Bishop Gore remarked of it, has been curiously neglected.

English people are particularly fortunate in the variety and range of their experience of the Gospel in its social working, and to the books mentioned might be added any sound textbook of English history. In the last hundred years the power of the Christian conscience has been repeatedly manifested in the national life: in the abolition of slavery in the Empire; in factory legislation—the centenaries of both came this year; in far-reaching legislation promoting education and health; and, less obviously but importantly, in the growth of a public opinion so morally apprehensive and fair-minded that the organization of labour for its betterment has been permitted and helped to go further than in any other country. If we will glance at our past, we may look forward with a hopefulness the absence of which is a serious handicap to-day.

III.

(1)

I have confined this paper almost entirely to a discovery of the social character of the Christian Gospel, and not ventured on yet another examination of the economic chaos which that Gospel must order, because I believe that the Christian's hesitation to-day to determine and act on his faith in social matters comes largely from an initial doubt concerning the relevancy of the Christian message. The hesitation is also a recognition of the complexity of modern social problems, but once the Christian is fully convinced, is *converted* to the view that the political and economic organization of society is his business, then the power of his faith will both compel and enable him to attend to it. He will do this as inspired and informed within the Church, and as his own situation makes possible. The conceptions of a Church and of a Christian which have governed this paper require the conclusions that the sufficiently immense task of a Church is to learn and persuade; and that while the Christian may be exhorted to his duty and instructed in it, he must himself decide—he can only himself decide—how to perform it. It is for this reason that a Church party in the State, with an economic and political programme, is out of the question.

But not only is society Christian business, it is promising business : for if the basic affirmations of the Christian faith have correspondence with reality, society cannot be successfully and permanently organized except by Christian means to Christian ends.

Despite the limitations we have so far set ourselves, this paper will be clearer for some illustration of the clash between the Christian conscience and contemporary society, and of the need for new interpretation and wider application of the Gospel if society, in fact disintegrating before our eyes, is to be reconstituted.

(2)

It should be the concern of Christians so to organize society that each member of it may serve it with a sense of vocation. It cannot be said that business as conducted to-day generously allows for this. To take an example at random. The payment

of shop assistants, for instance in drapers' shops, of a small or nominal wage to be augmented by commission on goods sold, presupposes that cupidity is the effective motive in human nature and is an attempt to ensure efficiency by appealing to it. It is not surprising that shops on this system habitually employ expensive firms for the detection of the petty thefts some few of their assistants commit; the wonder is that the integrity of their assistants as a class should be so high. Moral indignation that detective agencies should be necessary, on the part of those who approve of such a method of payment, is Gilbertian, for business so conducted ignores to this extent the moral law, and the dishonest assistant who gives his cupidity intelligent scope but fulfils his master's expectation of him. The securing of conditions, however, wherein all men and women may work from a sense of vocation will be seen on reflection to require the reorganization of our economic life from top to bottom. In terms of our present arrangements, work should be done rather as the professions do it than as the profit-seekers. It is an ironical reflection on a society avowedly based on private enterprise for personal gain that it should depend for some of its most vital services upon men with fixed or scaled salaries whose ability and devotion do not determine the reward they receive. This is entirely or partially true for the administrators of justice; for the civil services at home and in the colonies; for educationalists; the defence forces; the guardians of health and the ministers of the Gospel. To say as much is not to condemn the profit-seekers who, under our present chaotic arrangements, provide the means of life for both the professional and the manual workers. If the profit-seekers do not always provide abundance, the fault is as much with our arrangements as with them. Private enterprise, in its success, has built up a society in which it can no longer effectively operate, in which in fact it is ceasing to operate, though what shall supersede it is not yet in control. Profitable private enterprise, like a good tyranny, destroys itself.

(3)

The Christian conscience must condemn the employment of child labour. The introduction, thanks to inventors, of a press-button industrial machine is making the use of such

labour daily more possible. In northern towns thronged with unemployed men there are few boys, and still fewer girls, out of work. The conditions of child-employment are not strikingly bad, but the hours are long, the wages low, and the habit is to dismiss the employee when he or she reaches an age at which a living wage must be paid. In any case, the contention is that in a Christian country such employment should not be. Fourteen years of infancy and early childhood are not enough for the creation of the physique, mentality and spirituality which should grace the modern Christian. In practice the physical development is distorted and the mental and spiritual arrested when the child leaves school for factory or shop. A girl aged fifteen, working seven and eight hours a day at a mechanical occupation; already much concerned with money-making; out of reach of mental and moral instruction during her hours of useful wakefulness, and open to every undesirable influence present in a company of people of unequal ages and nearly all as primitive and uninformed as herself, cannot develop those qualities of character and mind which belong to a Christian lady. The case of the boy is no better. Night-schools are a palliative, and ineffective since the child is too tired to profit by them. They are, however, some national recognition of the wrongfulness of conditions which the well-to-do parents of the community would regard as intolerable for their own sons and daughters. When it is recalled that the pittances earned by these children are insufficient to allow them and their miserable dependents to purchase enough of what they produce to keep the machinery going, and that in the course of time child unemployment must inevitably follow upon adult unemployment, it is plain that, as usual, sound economics back the pronouncements of the Christian conscience. The effect on the family of the premature employment of the child, and of the parents' partial dependence on the child's wages, is to destroy the family as a moral and educative force more completely than the New Morality could ever achieve. It is a pity that influential Church dignitaries, who are so fond of discoursing on the family as an essential element in a Christian society, do not go on to condemn conditions which make their remarks so irrelevant as to be unintelligible for fifty per cent. of our population.

(4)

If Christians challenge society they are also challenged by it. Christianity is called to provide a social ethic which, because appropriate to the new social structure already foreshadowed, will stir the consciences of men.

Economic theory and social ethic, as developed since the spacious days of the Great Voyages and until the War, have presupposed worlds to be conquered, virgin territories to be exploited and settled, 'prizes for glittering swords,' and ever-expanding markets for agriculture and industry. The *laissez-faire* theory of the Manchester school, and the doctrine of Adam Smith which lay behind it that that state will prosper where each man is free to follow his own interest, suppose an elasticity of circumstances that will allow individuals room, in seeking their private wealth, to adjust themselves to each other and to all. A line of business successfully followed by one man would be reasonably avoided by others, or pursued in another place. What was called the economic system, though it was no system, consisted of a politically ordered collection of individuals each free to increase his activity and expand his wealth by reducing to his use still further tracts of the rich and unexploited world which lay all around the clearing of ordered society like virgin forest. The ambitious, the last-comers, or the rebellious American child each separately trekked westwards. Englishmen, as the first manufacturers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, could pursue their own interests in agricultural Europe and make themselves and England rich. The potentialities of the undeveloped world were vaguely thought of as Providence, and the actual wealth into which the potential might be turned as the reward of Providence for diligence, initiative and self-help. Honesty was the best policy. Control of the individual in his economic activity was hardly necessary and always resented as probably inspired by mistaken idealism ignorant of business and of 'economic laws.' Unification and central control, the treatment of the group as a reality, were academic projects. Outside Utopia, the group was sufficiently protected by free competition between its individuals. The common arrangements of trading which even the freest individuals must observe, at least in their trading with each other, reflected the nature of the economic

system as it was conceived to be. Thus, although no theory can strictly be said to have lain behind a growth so haphazard as finance, the relation of currency to goods and services was made to depend upon the value of gold in a free market, and so upon the quantity of the world's gold. This relation, it was supposed, would remain a constant, since each fresh opening up of territory, and so of markets, with resultant increase in the world's production, would lead to increased demand for gold and to new discoveries of gold-fields. The lag between the pioneering of the potential market, and that market's later effective demand for gold, was covered by credit based, and wholly dependent, upon the confidence of individuals that the economic order was an ever-expanding one and that they might safely bank on the future. The difficulty that the supply of gold might be artificially restricted to fall short of the world's demand was never squarely faced. The failure to discover gold-fields as fast as production increased led to the proposals of bi-metallism popular at the close of the last century, and still supported to-day by those who cling to the hope that a natural and undirected adjustment of money to goods and services may even yet be preserved. What is new in modern proposals is the suggestion that since the quantity of gold is so limited that the increase of productive powers leads annually to an increase in the value of gold in terms of goods, and so to falling prices with the consequential loss of individual confidence and breakdown of credit —processes which have reduced us to our present distress— therefore the production of the world should be restricted to bear some constant relation to the quantity of gold. It is this March Hare policy which inspires one advocation of a rise in prices; and it is the opposite of this policy which prompts the economic programme of America which some members of the World Economic Conference found so disturbing.[4]

The Christian social ethic which answered this free economy sufficiently well to work in it, proved to be remarkably like that

[4] A rise in prices would decrease the value of gold in terms of goods if in a currency pegged in some fixed relation to gold. The present rise in prices in America is incidental upon increasing the credit-resources of the country. America refuses to 'peg the dollar,' and her so-called 'inflation' is accompanied by government action in raising wages and limiting the rise in prices.

found in the New Testament. It is dangerously like, for now that conditions change, although it no longer works, it lingers on, claiming the sanction of the New Testament. The Early Church was unable to influence production and distribution, since these were in the hands of an aloof and non-Christian Empire; the Churches since the Reformation have not seen any necessity to be concerned with them because there was room in the world for each man harmlessly to follow his own economic interests. Both the Early and the Modern Churches rather directed the use of the private wealth which the Empire allowed or the prodigality of the untamed world provided. The Medieval Church theory is in contrast to both the Early and Modern Church theories. In the thirteenth century the social interpretation of religion could be elaborated in such doctrines as the Just Price: in the nineteenth, religion, as Lord Melbourne remarked, was a private affair.

In an expanding world the Christian was not concerned with the source, but with the use of his wealth. Religion indeed, as Weber has shown for Calvinism, could enjoin man's exploitation of the world as the fulfilment of his vocation; and it is plain from the lives of self-made business magnates that desire for money has been but one, and not the chief, of their motives. The source of a man's wealth was not clearly realized. It might be in India or darkest Africa, or genteel investments. Truly, where wealth was known to have been recently earned, and particularly by the more obvious profit-seeking pursuits such as shopkeeping and what was called 'trade,' the source was more evident. A man who clearly drew his wealth from the society was not accorded high social standing, and a sharp distinction was made between wealth so earned and wealth long owned or inherited. But the money a man had not earned, which he had perhaps of the bounty of nature or as reward of the goodness of Providence, but nobody asked with persistence, that wealth was his own. He did not have it of society; on the contrary, he might give it to society. It was his private income, to do with as he would, save under God. The saving clause was real, and upon it was built the social ethic of the Stewardship of Wealth. The Master had given the talents: their source was not in question; it was for the Christian to use them as his Master would approve. It was a

consumer's ethic which worked well in its time. In the service of the Church and the Empire, by charity in a hundred forms, Christian men devoted their private wealth to the public good. It is true that the possession of private wealth lent a man social standing and was accounted a virtue. It was the essential qualification of a gentleman, and men who possessed it were the persons desirable as clergymen, soldiers and Civil Servants; but this was a very natural confusion of thought in the minds of the possessors themselves, and in England at least not too much was made of it. To-day the ethic of the Stewardship of Wealth is ceasing to be operative because every condition which made it so is changing. This generation, its elders rightly complain, is not markedly social or ethical in its use of wealth.

The changes are many. The economic world is no longer elastic; the pioneering days are practically over; and individual action, once shock-absorbed by the wilderness, has immediate repercussions within society. Free competition is no longer both the creed and justification of private business. Hitherto independent firms are forced to find refuge in vast trusts and nationally-supervised Boards, and to operate then behind the bulwark of protective tariffs. In a world which machines have made more prodigal than ever before, men must learn co-operation not only in the use of private wealth but in the production and distribution of wealth, or, paradoxically, many of them must starve and the majority be poor. The unexploited and uncommercialized territories, free for private enterprise, have machinery and interests of their own. The close economic interdependence of the national groups upon each other, and of man upon man within the groups, necessitates that work in the world, from the growing of wheat to the issue of currency, must be deliberately controlled by men for their common needs, and, with the Gold Standard, Providence has departed from economic affairs. The World Economic Conference, though first of its kind, except as a world conference, was significant as epilogue, not as prologue. It was a common world attempt to preserve private interests, both of nations and of individuals, and from the inherent contradiction it burst early in its rotation. Mr. Bennett rightly told Canada that either the Conference must succeed or the present economic system come to an end.

With the disappearance of harmless fields for private enterprise there disappears the harmlessness of private wealth understood as wealth gained, directly or indirectly, by uncontrolled private manipulation of production and distribution. An economist of standing, though of pronounced views, can envisage as desirable the lowering of the rate of interest to vanishing point within the next thirty years.[5] Already the number of people possessing a private income is dwindling, and not only in countries with expensive social services. Where private income remains, no longer can a thoughtful man be blind to its source; its very diminution has sharply called his attention to the working of the social system, in all its ramifications, from which he derives his money. As his attention is aroused so is his conscience awakened, and it is the duty of his Church to instruct his conscience in its new range. A man's money is no longer his own, save under God. Inherited or earned, he has it of society, and the old comfortable distinction is now false.

The alternative forms of an economy ahead seem to be two. There might continue the private use for private ends of ever more magical machinery, and the private control of the distribution of machine-goods and of the production of territories once privately opened up. Society would consist of a dwindling number of ever richer individuals forced, in competition with each other, to employ ever fewer work-people at the longest hours and lowest wages for which they could be made to work. There would be a number of workless maintained in conditions just above the level at which would come revolution or serious disease, and this number would increase to a point after which they would begin to die off and the situation would be eased. This point in the curve would be more quickly reached if the use of contraceptive methods could be made general. The other alternative is common agreement to control the means of production and distribution to common ends. There are already signs that men may choose the second alternative as both the easier and morally better. Experiments in forms of economy collectively controlled are proceeding in Russia, Italy, and now in America. We in this country should watch the American experiment under the Industrial Recovery Act with especial sympathy and, may it

[5] Professor J. M. Keynes.

be said, study its methods rather than wait to see its results. What is important is that in America there has begun the reign of corporative experiment in the economic realm. It will be strange if the first attempts at social direction of economic affairs by a representative government are wholly successful. We can only be thankful that the first most costing efforts are being made at all, and with such determination and high courage. As Mr. Churchill has recently said, the complete failure of President Roosevelt would be a disaster not only for America but for the world.

Between the two alternatives broadly indicated above there can be but one choice for the Christian conscience. If the choice is to be more than academic, Christianity must evolve a social ethic appropriate to the society which is to be. Instead of a consumer's ethic directing the use of wealth, there is required an ethic which shall also promote co-operation in the greatest possible production of wealth and in a distribution of it at once equitable and economically sound. Men must know themselves appointed of God to a social or communal stewardship of wealth. Such stewardship may first have to be exercised by separate communities of men each more or less self-sufficient—America, the British Empire as a unit; certain combinations of European States; Russia, and one or two others. But eventually the communities, or economic groupings of the world, will have to learn world co-operation and agree to set up world-control if men are to enjoy to the full the bounty of the earth which God has made. Society challenges Christianity to provide it with the ideology and ethic which it needs for its economic welfare as urgently as the bewildered Christian needs them for his moral welfare.

At every point what appear as economic problems raise other and further complicating problems of conduct. Moral decision must precede effective economic action. The crux, for example, of Bernard Shaw's demonstration of the economic necessity and desirability of equality of income, were it conclusive or not, was his admission that what he called the 'metaphysical desire for equality' did not exist.[6] The creating and maintaining of the new society will involve the making, by individuals, of a succession of moral decisions. The Christian must learn to

[6] *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism.*

discern, and with reference to the new society, possessiveness good and bad and the opposing views of wealth which underlie each; ambition good and bad; work for personal advantage and work from a sense of vocation; and the economic end which a man should have in view from boyhood onwards. It is quite possible that a scientifically organized economy might proceed by un-Christian means to un-Christian ends. It is true that it would probably then rest ultimately upon force, though in this age of mass-suggestion that might not be at once perceived. As it is there are business firms and shops organized on much-advertized profit-sharing schemes in which conditions for the employees are more tyrannous and insecure than obtain in frankly capitalistic concerns and are the worse for their moral hypocrisy. Although theoretically possible, in practice it will be insuperably difficult to erect forms of public control which can eliminate the evils worked by greed if greed is a characteristic of the majority of the public. At the same time, it may prove necessary to check a greedy minority by force, and while this cannot be the business of the Church, it is already coming to be the business of the Christian State. Before the economic problem comes the moral problem. The preaching and teaching function of the Church was never more difficult or the need for it more urgent. Its performance, however, requires that the preachers and teachers, clerical and lay, shall be well versed in the causes of our economic disorder.

(5)

The coming of the control by society of the means of production and distribution plainly involves setting up an authority over economic affairs new to the world in scope. Authority, as Bergson showed, is centripetal in action, and the danger ahead is that we may attempt to escape from social poverty at the cost of individual liberty. In Russia, Italy and Germany that is no longer a danger but an evil. Lenin, Mussolini and Hitler each began his work and career with a purpose primarily economic and, significantly, socialistic. The economic achievements of the first two, and the programme of the last, have meant early interference in, and then a growing measure

of control over, the things of the mind and spirit. Economic dictatorship has easily become moral dictatorship and forced the subordination of religion, art and learning to the economic end. This has happened these three times, although only Lenin began with a completed political theory, the historical materialism of Marx, which envisaged such a development. It is a development which will prove most difficult to avoid because of the interdependence of the economic and the religious and moral. Yet it is that very interdependence which summons the Christian as such to take his part in the economy, and he has right when he insists that the organization of society shall allow for his transcendental Gospel. In fact a society can only be permanent which does claim the loyalty of man in his transcendental character, wherein he is at his greatest and most powerful. The Christian will say that prosperity dare not be bought at the expense of Christian individuality and its essential condition of liberty. The stones shall not be made bread.

Here again British people are fortunate in their tradition. The English Reformation, the Rebellion, and the English Revolution, although strong economic forces played their parts, were essentially concerned with issues rational, legal and political. These profound disturbances have laid elements of individualism and liberty deep in our public tradition and they have always helped to shape our economy. In late years the British Broadcasting Corporation is a singular achievement of the combination of liberty with order. The future form of socialization in this country may be already adumbrated in such experiments as the Electricity Board and the London Transport Board. In England the danger is perhaps not that the liberty of the individual may go, but that too narrow a view of that liberty and its conditions may most expensively delay the creation and recognition of that authority which the realm of economics now requires.

The incidence of an authority able to call force to its aid in the economic field will be as dangerous as it has been in religion and politics. It may well prove to be the chief incidence of such authority in the future, and that it shall be exercised for the whole social good, truly conceived, will demand vigilance of the Christian conscience.

IV.

(1)

The function of the Church in social affairs is the function of Christians acting together. The Church has no single voice, but rather the voices of her members, and there is no necessity for them, as the Bishops seem to imagine there is, to speak with unanimity or to be silent. This is an unreal dilemma because it is not the function of the Church to speak with finality, nor to enforce her pronouncements. Her's is a moral function to learn, teach and preach. The Church through her organization, congregational, diocesan and national, ought to provide facilities for her members to learn of and think out social affairs. Agreement of Christians on economic and political questions, wide enough to be effective, is, I believe, more possible to-day on the major issues than most Christians realize.

Christians hold that work should be done from a sense of vocation and not to secure wealth conceived of as possessing more than our neighbours or something our neighbours cannot have; would hold that creation and preservation of conditions in which a Christian personality may be fully developed should govern the administration of a nation or an empire; would hold, that now science has reached a stage which makes plenty possible for all men, it is foolish and wrong that inadequate social and economic organization, and the vested interests which profit by it, should stand between men and the plenty which ought to be theirs.

The world has need of the conversion of responsible and powerful individuals to such convictions. The ideal society, which is also the society of economic common-sense, can only come by the co-operation of many individuals of power, and with the active consent of all. Italy, Germany, and now America, afford evidence that in a world grown democratic despite itself, authority can only be set up after careful propaganda and teaching have won the consent of the group as a whole to the end the authority proclaims for its own. It is for Churchmen to see that any economic authority will only win consent when its means and ends are Christian; and, on the other hand, it is for

Churchmen, by teaching and preaching, to prepare present society for the coming of such a Christian economic authority. The social preaching of the Church is a threefold task.

(2)

Let it be plainly said that it is the duty of the Church to denounce social wrongs and follies as the Hebrew prophets castigated the evils of their day. One answer to the question with which this paper began is the observation that the Hebrew prophet, generally regarded as the prototype of the religious man, should have been so preoccupied with social and national affairs that it requires much ingenious reading between the lines to discover what his religion was.

Secondly, the Church should see to it that the real issues, moral and economic, are kept before the public at large and before the politician and the economic expert. This is the most immediate task at the moment. It is for the public to realize and desire what is right and profitable and for the expert to secure it as he can. In a newspaper-debate this year between two currency experts the effect of their respective policies upon the stomachs and backs of the population was not once mentioned. The English political system of the nineteenth century used the expert for general ends, and it is for Christian public opinion once more to set him his task. The single end of true economics today is to increase production and facilitate distribution of real wealth. The efficiency of machinery might be improved out of recognition by the free use of inventions and modern workshop methods which now vested interests suppress. Were it done, still for years to come the output of the machines would not satisfy the actual needs of the world's population. Let the expert aim at making effective demand correspond with actual need, not at curtailing satisfaction of need within the limits of present effective demand. Increased production and increased purchasing-powers constitute a difficult end, but advice to limit output, lower wages and increase prices is more difficult.

The real issues will not now be easily made clear to the public. The popular press in Great Britain could hardly work more mischief than it does at the present time, and the more patrician newspapers are not always helpful. Headlines in one

popular paper this year welcomed poor crops as Nature's aid to economic recovery. Articles in more than one paper regularly hail with delight rises in commodity prices which must eventually mean further shortage of food and clothes for the majority of their readers. The cynicism with which the intelligence of the readers has been estimated is impudent. The pulpit remains one of the few wholly free and disinterested platforms in this country, and the rapid spread of printing and ability to read may well prove not to have done away with the pulpit, but to have increased the need for it and for free, sincere and well-informed preachers.

Thirdly, the Church has to present positively the Christian ideal for society. The first step towards securing that ideal is creation of will to achieve it. This means the presentation of the Christian way of life to men as social beings. Here the social Gospel springs from the main stem of the religious life of the Church. In the last resort the Church has to inspire men to follow the Christian way. The world must be converted before it can be saved. Yet the prevalence of the misapplication of the truism that Christianity is a religion compels us to say again that the Church does not fulfil her whole function by the conversion of men to a private way of conduct and piety; nor by the cultivation and practice of prayer and worship, and of devotion, private and public. On the one hand, the religion of the Church when practised by the whole man becomes at once a social gospel; and on the other, the Christian ideal for the individual cannot be fully attained save in a society of a certain kind. The Church, in holding up the Christian virtues to men, should attempt again and again to apprehend the kind of social organization which the full practice of virtue requires. Greed, pride and apathy are to be condemned not only as personal sin but because they stand as barriers between the present distress and an ideal Christian society. The social implications of an immoral or non-moral outlook must repeatedly be made clear.

It is admittedly by trial and error that the ideal society may become actual, and the Church has no panacea to offer. It may be that the preaching and propaganda task of the Church requires for its best performance the setting up of some special organ for inquiry into and discussion of social affairs. This is a

proposition seriously to be considered. Again, there is need for further international Christian conferences such as Copec and the more recent Stockholm Conference. Their immediate result might be worse confusion and harsher perception of differences, but only out of them can emerge in the future that Christian international opinion without which the economic problems of the particular nations cannot be finally solved.

It goes without saying that no preaching will be fruitful unless individual Christians take every opportunity their situation in life affords to further Christian social morality and the recreation of the political and economic, the social and industrial worlds. They will be absolute in this,and regard dismissal, slow preferment, or the insidious persecution of social opinion as their crowns of which as modern saints they may be proud. There is good hope that the force of the Christian spirit already in the world would work the required revolution quickly and comparatively painlessly if once it were rigorously brought to bear by men who welcomed the cost to themselves.

(3)

The English Church, because of her long-standing and close, if undefinable, association with the State, is peculiarly well-fitted to find and preach the modern social interpretation of the faith manifest in the Life of the Gospels. The need to-day is not for the disestablishment of the Church of England, but for her re-establishment in the hearts and minds of the English people. The means to this end are not out of reach.

Within the English Church, let is be gladly acknowledged, how many of the Anglo-Catholic Movement have devoted their minds to social problems and their lives to the poor. The inspiration of Bishop Gore's social teaching has been powerful. Yet Modernism should be foremost in the fulfilment of the Church's social function. Modernists, avowedly, are not bound to any past interpretation of the Gospel ethic, be it that made in New Testament days or in the nineteenth century. Further, there is growing among them, and there ought to be encouraged, a piety, that fundamental determinant, neither Catholic nor Evangelical, as those terms have been understood. The Modern-

ist does not distinguish himself from the world, but distinguishes his loyalties and duties in a world at one with his nature and created by God his Father. He believes that the transcendental is to be served in life that is earthly, rational and moral. The challenge of his fellow-men in their present distress comes to him with especial clearness.

The charge that Modernism is but intellectualism is unfounded, but it is true that of necessity throughout this century Modernism has been preoccupied with the mystical and philosophical aspects of religion and with the history of religion, and unable to give much attention to the social interpretation. We must remember our nature and our origins. The birth of English Modernism came about in the quickened social conscience of such men as Frederick Denison Maurice. Modernism as a religion will be still-born if it does not now proceed, with religion's innate growing power, to elaborate its social gospel. The religion of the Hebrew prophets, of the New Testament and of the Reformation sprang from the whole heart and mind and was concerned with the entire range of life. True religion works as yeast on a man's whole existence; his social relations; his liberty; his culture; his physical life. Modernism has been conceived a soul; it must build a body. Not until Modernism is sufficiently grown to mean social revolution will it achieve the religious revolution for which it longs. Then will spring spontaneously from it, as from the Prophets, the early Christians and the Reformers, the new forms of worship, the creeds, the ritual and Church-organization of which the Modernist recognizes his age to be in need. In loyalty to nothing less than his religion let the Modernist see to it that the influence of the Church of England shall be more effectively what it has always been, one of the imponderables in the national life upon which leaders of good-will can reckon, and with which the others must reckon.

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN THE JUNIOR AND SENIOR SCHOOLS

By M. V. C. Jeffreys, M.A.

THE Bishop of Liverpool wrote: 'I have seen a form for terminal reports in which there were spaces for "personal cleanliness" and "religion," in each of which the boy was to be marked up to a maximum of 10.' The habit of mind that thus departmentalizes religion is strangely lacking in both reason and imagination. The claim of Christianity is either paramount and unconditional or it is entirely illusory. Christianity must be lived, not merely studied, and its concern is with the whole of life. The scope of religious education in the Elementary School, or in any other type of school, should therefore embrace much more than the Scripture lesson. Religious education in school has three aspects: instruction in the classroom, worship in the school hall, and, thirdly, that less definable thing, the influence exerted by masters upon boys, and by boys upon one another, in all the contacts, formal and informal, of school life.

In this paper I propose to say very little on the question of denominational and undenominational teaching, for we have to accept the present situation in the Provided schools and make the best of it. There are really two distinct questions involved. First, can religious instruction ever take a properly defined shape so long as it is dissolved in the vagueness of the Cowper Temple régime? Admittedly some impoverishment, both of worship and of instruction, is inevitable, but I hope to show that the loss, where children under the age of adolescence are concerned, need not be great. Meanwhile there is the supplementary influence of the churches and of the home; but a consideration of these aspects of religious education lies outside the scope of this paper. Secondly, are teachers of different denominations likely to trust one another sufficiently to combine to give truly Christian teaching? Examples of startling bitterness still occur, but a fact of importance is that the younger teachers, now going out from the Training Departments, are less and less concerned with denominational distinctions, and more and more concerned to dis-

cover what are the essentials of the Christian faith and life. The most serious danger to-day comes, not from the bloodshed of warring creeds, but from the anaemia produced by a prevailing species of benevolent humanism that simulates Christianity. The most urgent need to-day is to strengthen and extend the Christianity which is not merely our twentieth-century human decency in religious guise. It is not unreasonable to hope that, in the pursuit of this end, the undenominational basis of instruction in our schools may prove as much a help as a hindrance — it is a help in so far as it may conduce to laying bare the central issues. The key to the position is obviously the training of the teachers; in this respect the outlook is both bright and gloomy —bright as regards the awakening of thought and interest among the students of Training Colleges, but gloomy as regards the provision made for their equipment as teachers of religion.

I use the terms 'Junior and Seniors Schools' in the title of this paper, in place of the more familiar term 'Elementary,' for the Elementary School no longer exists. We speak of the Primary Schools (Infants' and Junior), in which children are until the age of eleven plus; the upper part of the Elementary School has become the Senior School, which belongs, with the Central and Secondary Schools, to the Post-Primary group. The word 'Elementary' has been discoloured by its historical associations, and its banishment from the language of administration marks the dawn of a new educational era — or so we hope.

'Elementary Education' has denoted, not merely the early stages of an education that is to be carried further, but that inferior type of education, limited in length, breadth and depth, that has in the past been considered sufficient for five-sixths of the population; and it has implied inequalities of status and remuneration between teachers in schools of different grades — inequalities for which it is not easy to discover any intrinsic reason.

The reshaping of our school system that is now in progress on the lines of the Hadow Report is, as everybody knows, far more than an administrative reorganization. And it means more than an attempt to raise the school-leaving age for all pupils. It implies the universal application of the principle that education

should be concerned with the whole child, body and soul. The principle is an ancient one, but the serious attempt to apply it to all children is new, and is the central and common feature of the educational reforms that are taking place to-day in most of the civilized countries of the world. The acquisition of certain specified skills, whether they be reading, writing and counting, or the laying of bricks, is no longer held to constitute an adequate education, even for the poorest children, if their bodies and souls are meanwhile left to take care of themselves. To-day we aspire to provide an education that shall be wider in scope and richer in content — which will secure for all children a fair chance of properly organizing their whole personalities. The universal and impartial provision of such opportunity, which has not been afforded in the past, represents nothing less than our positive obligation to the individual child as such, and to the world of the coming generation. In the words of the Hadow Report: 'There is no capital more productive than the energies of human beings. There is no investment more remunerative than expenditure devoted to developing them.' In short, two generations after assuming the responsibility of educating its children, the community is beginning to appreciate the full implications of that responsibility.

The education of the 'whole child' is an ideal which may never be realized; but its attainment is the ultimate aim of our present programme of reforms, seriously crippled as they are by a policy which is regarded by some as a discreet measure of retrenchment, and by others as a stupid waste of opportunity. Enough, however, has already been accomplished to reveal possibilities and sanction hopes. The schools are not only changing their names; they are changing their characters. The Infant School has already ceased to be a mere forcing-house, and is reflecting more clearly the maxim of Sir John Adams: 'Childhood has a meaning and a value in itself apart from its value as a stage on the way to maturity.' The Junior Schools already benefit from the example of the Infant Schools, and from the separation of the Senior Schools.

The Senior School (11 plus to 14 plus) is only beginning to discover its new functions, and its emergence from the husk of the older tradition will not be accomplished without difficulty.

The task of the Senior School is a hard one; it has to take all those boys and girls who are intellectually, though not physiologically, below the level of the pupils who go to the Central and Secondary Schools, and it has to prepare them for life in three years. The time is impossibly short; it must be lengthened before we can expect any substantial achievement. The task of the Senior School is peculiar, not only in its difficulty, but in its nature. A Senior School boy of 14 and a Secondary School boy of 12 might get the same marks for the same examination paper, but they present entirely different educational problems. The Senior School has to cope with limited intelligence, combined frequently with premature sophistication, standing in imminent proximity to the world of work and wages. The curriculum must be adjusted, not merely in standard, but in its very nature. It must be practical, without being narrowly vocational; it must contrive to promote a reasonably critical and independent attitude of mind by means other than intellectual exercises of the traditionally academic sort. Possibly the Scout and Guide movements may be a more valuable source of inspiration for this kind of school than any of the systems hitherto employed in scholastic institutions. However that may be, there is no doubt that the success or failure of the Senior School in the next twenty or thirty years will determine the fate of our whole educational experiment.

A consideration of the new aims in education has a very definite relevance to the subject of Religious Instruction. The essence of the New Education is its acknowledged concern with the whole personality of the pupil. Christianity has always claimed the whole personality of the Christian. There is a common ground here — the sphere of operations is the same. And there is an obvious challenge. A School of Typewriting may legitimately ignore the spiritual experiences of its students. But an educational system that expressly assumes responsibility for the spiritual development of the boys and girls of a nation can scarcely escape the challenge of the Christian Gospel.

Let us briefly consider the present position of religious teaching in the Junior and Senior Schools. There is much to be thankful for. Our schools have not been secularized as in some

countries. On the contrary, some kind of religious teaching is given in almost all the schools, although there is no statutory compulsion in the matter. The N.U.T. has expressly declared its belief in the value of religious instruction, and urges, through its weekly organ, that teachers should be better equipped, academically as well as pedagogically, to give this instruction.[1] *The Times Educational Supplement* has claimed that 'all experts and authorities' are of the same opinion.[2] The old controversy that raged round what the text-books describe as 'the religious difficulty' has cooled down considerably since 1902; and there has been a general tendency towards conciliation and co-operation, notably since about 1925. Consequently, much has been achieved, by agreement between the churches and the Local Education Authorities, in the way of improving all syllabuses and securing their general adoption; nearly two-thirds of the 318 L.E.A.'s have adopted approved syllabuses of some sort, though some of these are ancient and unsuitable. The syllabuses at present in use vary enormously in quality; some are excellent, and the Cambridgeshire Syllabus may be taken as an example of the best.

The important facts are that the value of religious instruction is clearly recognized, that the Council Schools provide religious instruction without being compelled to do so, that the Churches and the L.E.A.'s are co-operating as never before to prepare suitable courses of instruction, and that attention is being paid to the need for instructing the teachers. That is the bright side of the picture. There is another side, which is far less attractive.

In the first place, the time given to religious instruction is brief and badly distributed. The Archbishops' Committee of 1929 estimated that the total time devoted to religious work of some kind represents one-seventh of the school week; this time is made up of $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours of instruction and $1\frac{1}{4}$ hours spent in opening and closing the school sessions; and the Report of the Committee adds the significant words: ' . . . if the time-table is

[1] *Cf.* the resolution of the Harrogate Conference to this effect: January, 1933.

[2] The controversy as to whether religious knowledge should be placed on the syllabus for the Teacher's Certificate, and subjected to examination, is a subsidiary issue.

strictly maintained.' So long as these 2½ hours of instruction are spread evenly over the five days of the school week, and so long as the Scripture period is taken at the beginning of the morning, when brains are reluctant and registers have to be marked, there cannot be much hope of profitable work.

Secondly, when due allowance has been made for the existence of many zealous and competent teachers, and for the use of revised syllabuses, the fact remains that the quality of religious instruction is, on the whole, poor. Church Schools and Sunday Schools come under this condemnation as well as the Council Schools. Not only is the teacher's academic equipment often inadequate; not only is he often paralyzed by lack of faith, vagueness of aim, and confusion of thought; he is — no doubt partly owing to these disabilities — too often content with an obsolete teaching technique. The bad old ways persist in religious instruction when they have long been rejected from the teaching of every other subject in the curriculum. Handwork, dramatization, and all the modern aids and devices are frequently neglected, the modern emphasis on the value of concrete, pictorial impressions is frequently forgotten, and dull, mechanical, repetitive lessons are given with grubby old Bibles and tattered books of hymns. It would be ungracious not to recognize the enormous improvement in teaching technique that has already taken place in countless schools, both Provided and Non-Provided. But the fact remains that, as regards teaching method, religious instruction has lagged behind the other school subjects, and that many teachers would be ashamed to be found teaching History, Geography, or Nature Study, in the way in which they teach Scripture.

Thirdly, in spite of the improved relations between the L.E.A.'s and the Churches, there is still a feeling, in the L.E.A.'s, in the Board of Education, and in the schools themselves, that religious instruction is too prickly a thing to be touched except when absolutely necessary, and then only with extreme caution. The Board of Education and the L.C.C. avoid showing an official interest in religious education.[3] There are,

[3] It is true that pronouncements in favour of religious education have been made recently by Ministers of Education: by Lord Eustace Percy in 1926, and by Lord Irwin in 1933. But Cabinet Ministers are not to be identified with the Government Departments of which they are the temporary heads.

in the personel of both these authorities, individuals who are profoundly and effectively interested in religious teaching. But religious instruction is not inspected by the Board's inspectors or by those of the Local Authorities. The Board has not, to my knowledge, issued any publication on religious education. The Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers, which is 'the main channel for the expression of the Board's views on curriculum,' has no section on religious teaching, and only two brief incidental references to it, one of which is somewhat unhappily expressed. The schools themselves are jealous of interference. The N.U.T. some time ago issued a circular to the L.E.A.'s urging that Managers of Non-Provided schools should not ask applicants for teaching posts whether they were willing to undertake parochial duties. Behind that lies a curious tradition of distrust, and a layman may hear strange tales in the schools of exploitation of teachers by vicars in the bad old days — we sometimes forget that, as lately as 1903, the Anglican Church Schools still outnumbered all the other schools put together. Beneath the petty suspicions and jealousies there probably lies a deeper feeling — that the Church has been too ready to claim rights and privileges in virtue of past labours and past heroisms, and too little able (spiritually as well as financially) to take the lead in proving that the religious education of the people (old as well as young) can be made a living reality. As regards inspection, the Provided schools have the advantages and disadvantages of immunity. As a headmaster put it: 'If the inspector comes here, I can tell him two things that he can't do; he can't inspect my Scripture, and he can't ring my fire-bell.'

Fourthly, and most important of all, religious education in our schools is enfeebled owing to the spiritual perplexity of our modern world. Our culture has lost its bearings. It would be superfluous to attempt here another clinical picture of the modern temper. We are quite accustomed to being told what is the matter with us, and the pleasure we derive from passively contemplating our unhealthy condition is itself doubtless one of the major symptoms of the disease. What is immediately relevant to the present discussion is that many teachers (probably a large majority) are entirely vague as to what they believe and think, but are interested, in a general way, in religious problems. If one may judge from an acquaintance with some of the more thoughtful

and better educated of the young men and women now passing through the Training Departments, one cannot fail to be impressed by their growing curiosity about religious issues. A large number of these students, as far as it is possible to judge from conversation, are anxious to discover what Christianity really is in its essentials, and whether the Christian view is one that will prove efficacious as a way of approaching the problems of life to-day. While the attitude of most is, quite naturally, sceptical or at least interrogative, there are a few whose positions are defined with some precision. But, among them all, there seems little tendency to attach importance to denominational distinctions.

The stirring of the minds of the younger generation is certainly not to be attributed to the specific agencies (such as the Oxford Group movement), which are themselves symptoms of something much more general. As one international conference after another proceeds from its baptism of hopeful eloquence to its inglorious obsequies, our young men and women seem to be wondering whether human society is capable of accomplishing its own salvation. A growing number of students in training are ready to respond if facilities are provided for their equipment as teachers of religion.

I am in no way qualified to discuss the arrangements in the Church Training Colleges or in the undenominational Two-Year Colleges. The following remarks upon the University Training Departments are not meant to imply a disregard of the work of the Church in training teachers; the Church has clearly seen the supreme importance of training and has concentrated her educational effort in this direction.[4] Nor, with regard to the undenomi-

[1] The following figures, supplied by the Central Board of Finance, give an impression of the proportion of teachers trained by Anglican Colleges. Numbers of students recognised by the Board of Education for the year 1933-4 in Colleges in England and Wales:—

University Training Departments	4,555
University College Training Departments	951
Local Education Authorities' Colleges	3,340
Church of England Colleges	3,860
Roman Catholic Colleges	967
Wesleyan Colleges	269
British and Foreign Colleges	464
Other Voluntary Colleges	1,214
	15,620

national Two-Year Colleges, should the work of the Religious Education Committee of the Training College Association be forgotten. In the Training Departments of the Universities, however, the situation is far from satisfactory. Since these Departments train graduates, who are supposed to be on the whole superior to the students of the Two-Year Colleges in ability as well as in academic attainment, and since the flow of graduates into the Elementary Schools is increasing, the position in the University Training Departments is very important. In these blandly secular institutions some lectures on the method of religious instruction are generally given, though the lecturer's chief qualification is often his willingness to lecture on the subject rather than any real competence to do so. These courses of lectures are optional and brief.

The problem cannot be solved, however, by multiplying the lectures, or by engaging Professors of Divinity to deliver them. The real trouble is that the students lack theological knowledge, and that lectures on teaching-method assume a sufficient amount of academic knowledge. It is one thing to lecture on the teaching of Chemistry or History to students who have taken their degrees in these subjects; it is quite another thing to lecture on religious instruction to students who have practically no background of knowledge, and whose studies in some cases terminated by taking 'Scripture' as a soft option in the School Certificate, and in other cases on their entry to the Secondary School. From many quarters it is urged that teachers should be better equipped to give religious instruction. But there can be little real improvement unless the students can be given an opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of the subject itself. This opportunity might be provided in the University either in the degree course or in the training course. If the proposals for instituting a 'General Honours' degree were carried through, it would be possible for students to take some branch of religious knowledge as part of their degree course. And if in the training course religious instruction were promoted to the position of one of several alternative Special Subjects, a more thorough study would be possible. To each of these changes, however, there would be opposition.

The real solution of the problem can only come as a result of a considerable movement of public opinion. Religion is not

likely to win a paramount position in schools or Training Colleges until society as a whole is prepared at least to acquiesce in the adoption of such an educational perspective. As long as religious instruction is regarded as one 'subject' among others on the time-table, worth retaining because, in a general way, it is felt to have a humanizing influence, so long shall we have to make the best of half-measures. As long as the Christian doctrine is regarded by many as a picturesque, though rather superfluous, symbolism for the expression of moral principles that are generally acknowledged, so long will our education be less than Christian in its intentions.

If the teachers do not know what they think, and are lacking in academic knowledge, they can hardly be expected to teach anything satisfactorily. But, in demanding that the teacher should know his own mind, there are some things which we certainly do not mean. All modern educationalists would agree that religious teaching should not consist of anything in the nature of enforced inculcation or authoritative superimposition of opinion, and would demand the relegation of the more strictly doctrinal problems to a comparatively late stage of the pupil's course. And many Christians to-day would agree that the essential truths of Christianity may be disclosed through teaching that can fairly be described as undenominational. These reflections certainly do not dispose of the case for denominational teaching, which, if conducted with due regard to the findings of modern child-study, would always be preferable to the best undenominational teaching, for the simple reason that the total impression is likely to be more cogent and concrete if teaching and worship in Church, in Day School and in Sunday School, form a properly integrated whole. But we can at least have some grounds for believing that undenominational teaching can accomplish much that is valuable, in the earlier years of school life at any rate. The more clearly we realize the true sequence in which the different aspects of religion should be presented to the child (which is essentially the sequence in which Jesus presented them to His followers), the more readily can we reconcile ourselves to an undenominational approach. Jesus in the full reality of His man-

hood must be felt before the majesty of His presence compels the acknowledgment of His divinity. Christ as the friend of children, as well as of sinners, must be known before the ethical implications of His Gospel can be appreciated, or the metaphysics of salvation be understood. If religion be taught as it should be, the occasion for denominational differentiation does not arise much before adolescence. What the child chiefly needs in the Junior and Senior Schools is not an exposition of authorized doctrine, but the living story of Jesus' ministry among men, and of the Christian saints and heroes from that day to this.

The formulation and critical consideration of doctrine does not belong to the education of the child before adolescence. The child of seven, eight and nine will still be sufficiently occupied in learning to know Jesus as someone who really and truly lived. Theology should never be expounded till the child is ready for it; the acknowledgment of Christ's divinity should be an act on the child's part; and that act of acknowledgment should be implicit long before it becomes explicit. At the age of nine the child should have grasped the fact that Jesus came from God to show us what God is like ('Christ the image of the invisible God'). At eleven or twelve he will be seriously puzzled by the Crucifixion; he will be stirred by its tragedy and thrilled by the majesty of Jesus, unflinching and alone before His judges. He will dimly realize that the Crucifixion lay somehow in the logic of Jesus' appointed destiny. Not till he arrives at the age of fourteen or fifteen will he require an explicit formulation of his creed, which has meanwhile been growing, almost without his knowing it, towards formulation. When that time comes, earlier impressions can be gathered and clarified, and an interpretation can be attempted, more in terms of Love than of Justice. The sufferings of Christ are what it costs God to take upon Himself our mortality, and it is only by so taking our nature upon Him that He can reveal His nature to us in terms that we can understand. Christ died to show the lengths to which God will go in His love for man, not to show how much the mercy of God costs to purchase. Some such expression will probably answer the needs of the boy or girl at this stage.

A question may here be fairly asked which lies at the heart of the whole problem of religious education. The child is not to be indoctrinated, but is to be allowed to find his own way to the truth. And yet the teacher's supreme object is to insure that the child shall find God in Christ. Is there not a possibility that the teacher will be embarrassed by this dual requirement? In a sense he will, for all true teaching is difficult. But the real answer to the question depends upon whether or not we believe that a recognition of God in Christ arises naturally from a proper study of the Gospels. If we believe that the New Testament can speak for itself, and that the affirmation 'Thou art the Christ!' is a response compelled by true acquaintance, the apparent contradiction of aim and method disappears. If, on the other hand, we feel that we are trying to introduce something that is not there, to force an interpretation which the facts will not sustain, we had better ask the headmaster to excuse us from teaching Scripture. It is the *a priori* method which must be avoided. We must try to follow Jesus' own teaching-method. Let the child hear about God from the mouth of Jesus, and so come to feel that God is like Jesus. Let the child feel the mystery and majesty of Jesus, as His immediate followers felt it, and the wonder that the multitude felt at His words. Then let him hear Jesus' own claim, 'I and the Father are one,' and let him make of that what he will. Jesus rather than the schoolmaster is the real teacher, for it is Jesus and not the schoolmaster who can lead the child to the Mount of Transfiguration.

The rest of this paper consists of some practical suggestions concerning teaching-method and public worship in school. So far I have tried to establish the following propositions: (1) that the New Education, by claiming the whole personality of the child as its field, has to face the challenge of religion; (2) that religious education in our Junior and Senior Schools, although much improved, is hampered by bad time-table arrangements, by poor teaching technique and the insufficient academic equipment of teachers, by the prevalence of distrust and excessive caution, and by the vagueness and confusion of modern thought; (3) that the principal needs of the pre-adolescent child can be supplied through undenominational teaching, that the central aim should

be to enable the child to know Jesus as a real person, not merely as a formula or a dreamy sentiment, and that explicitly doctrinal teaching should be postponed till adolescence; and (4) that no teaching can be approved which implies in the teacher or promotes in the pupil any confusion as to what are the essentials of the Christian Faith, and that those essentials consist in a quality of life rendered possible by God's act of love in taking our nature upon Him in order to reveal His nature to us, and conditioned by our response to that act. I have also tried to indicate the kind of way in which the child should be progressively led to appreciate the central truth of Christianity.

I propose to deal very briefly with teaching-method, and scarcely at all with the question of syllabus. There are many good ways of arranging a course of Scripture study, and some of these are available in the revised syllabuses. As regards the choice of material, a few principles may be summarized thus:

(1) Material should be carefully selected, especially for young children. The chapter on the sacrifice of Isaac in Grigg-Smith's *The Child's Knowledge of God* is extremely illuminating as regards the dangers of unsuitable material. To say more on this question of selection would involve a discussion of miracle and of primitive ideas of God. At all events, no one can draw up a satisfactory syllabus who has not considerable experience of the ways in which children's minds work, readily accessible as they are to the appeal of the supernatural, and yet so literal, narrowly and pertinaciously logical, unsentimental and difficult to hoodwink.

(2) The life and person of Jesus should occupy a central position throughout the course. We cannot approve a syllabus, such as that used until lately in a certain Secondary School, whereby the lowest form began with *Genesis*, and the Gospel story was arrived at in the third year of school life. In presenting the person of Jesus, the sequence of His own revelation of Himself should, as Professor Raven has urged, be studied and followed.

(3) There should be a progressive advance towards systematization. Young children should be given stories — tales of the children and heroes of the Old Testament, stories of Jesus and

of heroes of the Faith in later times. To children under eight the stories had better be told orally, and, when the pupils come to read for themselves, the text used should be a simplified and modernized one. The language of the Authorized or Revised Version is not suitable for children under ten at any rate. In fact, before pupils use these versions, they should have some historical understanding of why the language is different from the English to which they are accustomed; they should know it as the real tongue of their fathers, not as a queer, conventional language of sanctity. From nine to twelve the treatment should be more continuous; some attempt should be made to build up a connected history of the Hebrew people, and of our Lord's life, together with a study of contemporary manners and customs. From eleven to fourteen some interpretation of the history is possible; not only external events, but ideas and feelings may be studied; the development of Hebrew temperament and thought; a clearer view of the personality of Jesus as a whole, His view of His purpose, and the nature of God as revealed by Him, with a picture of the world into which He came.

As regards method, there are two main principles that should govern the teaching of any subject: Reality and Activity. The child should be able to feel that the things he studies belong to real life and are relevant to his life, that they are not merely figments or formal exercises. And the pupil should *do* something; he should make, discover, arrange, not merely swallow and regurgitate. 'I like learning, but I hate being taught,' represents the true attitude of most children, and a very proper attitude at that.

There has been a very unfortunate separation of sacred from secular history, and the teacher who succeeds in bringing back sacred history into the world of reality has done a most valuable work. Too often the Biblical story has a dream-like quality. Miss Wodehouse mentions the servant-girl who was astonished to discover that Jerusalem is a real place. A master in a certain Elementary School, who visited Jerusalem and other places of Palestine during the late war, is able to make his Scripture lessons absorbingly interesting to the boys. In many schools Scripture is taught with little or no reference to the

general historical setting; and, on the other hand, there are many short surveys of world history which contain no reference to Jesus of Nazareth. This situation is absurd and lamentable. The sense of reality must be strengthened by relating the story to its general historical background, by filling in the gap between the Old and New Testaments, by giving some account of excavation and research from Henry Creswicke Rawlinson onwards, by a study of manners and customs and of geography on the lines of George Adam Smith's *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, and by considering the development of the Biblical literature.[5] In particular there must be some attempt, with pupils approaching the age of fourteen at any rate, to build up a picture of the Mediterranean world at the beginning of the Christian era. And the teaching should aim throughout at explaining graphically the references to contemporary practices, agriculture, fishing, costume, implements, and so on, so that the pupil may be able to visualize the story and its setting as precisely as possible. The story must come to life; the *thing* must be brought forth from behind the *words*.

I said earlier that, generally speaking, teachers to-day would be ashamed to be found teaching other subjects as badly as they are content to teach Scripture. By that I mean, chiefly, that the pupil is less active in the Scripture lesson than in other lessons. There is too much passive reception and mechanical memorizing, though in some of the better Sunday Schools and Infant Schools there is much improvement in method. Young children, below the age of nine, should be encouraged to dramatize some of the stories that they hear and read; many Old Testament stories and some of the parables lend themselves to dramatization. Older pupils, in the Central School, for instance, might attempt a play such as Masefield's 'Good Friday,' or a Miracle Play. Drawing and modelling are of great value, for older pupils as well as for younger; such things as Abraham's tent, Egyptian methods of transport, the Jerusalem Temple, a Byzantine church afford constructional problems of varying difficulty. Charts, chronological and other, can be made, and are

[5] I have overheard the remark from a graduate student, after an elementary lecture on the growth of the Hebrew literature: 'Well, I never knew about all that.'

the best way of graphically summarizing material for young pupils. But charts are of little value if they are abstract; a map showing St. Paul's journeys in different coloured lines is not likely to be anything more to the child than just a map with some coloured lines on it. But an illustrated chart of the development of the Temple, from the portable tabernacle onwards, will have interest and value, however hypothetical the reconstructions may be, provided some real labour has been expended by the children themselves in hunting out their material. Children should, of course, work in groups of three or four when making charts and models.

With older pupils, use may be made of Assignments, or some other kind of individual work. Since the scope of desirable study is great out of all proportion to the time available, the best method is to induce pupils to take up different topics and to pool the results. Thus, in a form of boys of thirteen to fourteen, some might study the Roman Empire, others might find out what they can about the religions of India, some could read about modern missions, life in ancient Egypt, the transmission of the New Testament, and so on.

Pupils of all ages should be given some opportunity of writing original compositions. Older boys and girls could get some inspiration from *By an Unknown Disciple*, or they could invent parables of modern life. Younger children could re-tell, in their own words, and with encouragement to supply (and even invent) local colour freely, any of the stories that they have heard or read.

At the beginning of this paper I mentioned the peculiar difficulties of the Senior School, which takes the duller pupils when they are verging upon their clumsy and inarticulate adolescence. Religious teaching in the Senior School must be adjusted to this type of pupil. The personal appeal of Jesus is of special value to them, for abstract ideas are practically meaningless to them. Corporate worship also is valuable, for it provides an outlet for feelings which they cannot or will not express individually, and it extroverts them. Music is an excellent medium of expression for these pupils. Their work in the classroom should be as pictorial and manual as possible; objects, pictures and actions mean more to them than words; they do not read

with facility, and they write and speak with difficulty. As much individual work as possible, and work in small groups, should be done, for these pupils display more intelligence when allowed independence. Finally, religious problems should be brought into practical relation with actual life; although, as it has been truly said, 'there is in a sense no Christian Ethic,' these boys and girls must be enabled to see, in simple and obvious ways, that Christianity does have practical bearings upon the way in which a man conducts himself from day to day, and upon the way in which communities are related to one another.

This very inadequate discussion of method can scarcely be left without mention of that sanctified term, Correlation. Some arrangement must clearly be arrived at by which the History syllabus and the Scripture syllabus shall fit in with each other; it matters little whether a topic such as ancient Egypt or the Roman Empire is dealt with in the History lesson or in the Scripture lesson, provided it is dealt with somewhere, and is not done twice over in such a way that the pupil fails to recognize the Rome of 'Scripture' as being the same Rome of 'History.' Correlation, however, is better accomplished by conversation and good understanding in the Staff Room than by meticulous delimitation of syllabuses. Too rigid a syllabus cramps the good teacher, and the bad teacher will generally manage to be bad in any case. What is important is that the teacher should know what his colleagues are doing, and that interconnected work should be kept coherent by frequent Staff Room conversation. In many Staff Rooms, however, there is a robust taboo against the talking of 'shop.' The chief value of referring to correlation in this connection is to emphasize the danger of allowing religious instruction to fall into a separate compartment of its own —separate not only from history, geography and literature, but from life. The Scripture lesson, although there is a real sense in which it should be different in spirit from all other lessons, should not be an occasion for the assumption of an unusual manner or a peculiar voice; it should not be felt that a queer game is being played, in which both teacher and pupils have to pretend to be something that each knows the other is not. The pupil should not be made to feel that he is being sedulously

'improved,' nor challenged to produce evidence of the spiritual benefits he has received.[6] The work of the Scripture lesson must above all things have a real-life quality; and, if it is different from other lessons, the difference should be one of greater reality, greater confidence and candour, more weight. It is not enough that the work should be interesting and lively; it must also be sacred. The Scripture lesson cannot have the character it should have unless it stands in its proper relation to the school worship, and unless the whole life and work of the school is felt and thought of as the service of God.

So far no reference has been made to public worship in school. Worship should be felt to be a natural and necessary part of life, and a system of religious education fails if it is limited to classroom instruction. A Training College student wrote in one of her examination papers: 'One of the most vivid recollections of my own schooldays is the boredom which morning prayers occasioned; it was the only part of the day when school was really boring, and one envied the "train" girls who arrived just too late, or those who on account of their religious beliefs were allowed to be absent from this function.' We are so accustomed to 'assemblies' perfunctory in spirit and monotonous in ritual, providing a convenient occasion for the publication of school notices, a preface to cautionary exhortation, and a neutral background for the explosion of the occasional first-class

[6] The following questions were recently asked in many schools, of several thousands of children. They appear in a book which in other respects contains much very good sense:—

Q. Whom have you heard about from the Bible?
A. Abraham.
Q. In what ways were you better boys and girls after learning about him?
A. We don't know.
Q. Did you ever think of this before?
A. No.
Q. Was your trust in God greater after learning of Abraham's great faith?
A. No.
Q. Are you better boys and girls to-day than you were a year ago?
A. We don't know.
Q. Have you learnt the Apostles' Creed?
A. Yes.

The answers quoted are some of the actual ones received.

'row,' that we may forget that there are schools in which short services of real beauty and significance are held at the beginning and end of the day's work.

The ordering of the school services should be governed by the same two principles of Reality and Activity which are to be observed in classroom instruction. Hymns and prayers are unsuitable which employ language and express sentiments that are remote or false for the child. Much of the order of Common Prayer, especially the Collects, has for the child a stilted and unreal quality; it is a pity that he should be bored by it in years before he acquires enough literary and historical knowledge, and enough experience of life, to appreciate it. There are books of more suitable prayers to be had, such as *This Day*, which is a collection of those read at the daily Broadcast services. Morbid preoccupation with human depravity and the burden of sin, and the kind of ecstasy that yields to such pious frivolities as the casting of golden crowns beside the glassy sea, are out of place in juvenile worship, although the young have an exasperating habit of becoming deeply attached to hymns of this kind. Equally out of place is the prayer or hymn which is designedly childish; children are much less childish than sentimental adults. Worship in school should spring from real experience and embody real experience. A larger place than in adult worship should be accorded to that natural piety which responds to the beauty and wonder of nature. Reference should be made to the life of the school and the neighbourhood; social and economic problems like illness and unemployment, which touch the child's life, should be remembered in prayer, as well as the activities of the school. There is a value in praying for individuals, such as a pupil dangerously ill, provided that these personal references are made with discretion and without any sanctimonious flavour. Plenty of variety should be afforded, to keep the services alive; the season's of the Church's year, and of the natural year, will provide *motifs* for services, and a good plan is to make the service expressive of a single leading idea, so that a definite impression can be gained from it.

Pupils should take an active share in school worship, and this activity should not merely consist of their roaring horribly in the hymns. There is no reason why a small, trained choir

should not sometimes give a really good rendering of a short anthem; this is the practice in some schools. Nor is there any reason why the pupils, acting through a committee of prefects in collaboration with the headmaster, should not contribute to the choice of prayers and the arrangement of the service. The pupils should be able to feel that the service is their service, not a discipline to which the headmaster subjects them, and that if they are bored by it the fault is at least partly their own.

If the school services have the vitality that springs from relevance, dignity, naturalness and spontaneity, there is no reason why the fact of their being undenominational should make them colourless or ineffective. Where individuals of various creeds associate there can be a positive value in the collective acknowledgment of a common Christianity.

It stands to reason that worship, if it is to be intelligent and significant, must be related, not only to life as a whole, but in particular to the rest of the pupil's religious instruction. There are few schools indeed in which any attempt is made to bring worship and instruction together. Yet the meaning and nature of worship should certainly be discussed in the classroom. If the matter is treated in the right way, the young child will readily think of worship as 'talking to God because God wants His children to talk to Him.' Children should be led to think of prayer primarily as an act of acknowledgement, reverence and praise, a consecration of themselves to God without *arrière pensée*, rather than as a device for procuring the services of a mysterious factotum who can be prevailed upon to come and do odd jobs if suitably approached. The small boy who asked leave to recite, in place of his usual prayer, a nursery rhyme, because it would 'amuse Jesus,' had in him the true spirit of worship. The problems of petitionary prayer must be met by placing prayer in its proper perspective; worship must be clearly seen as the consecration of ourselves to the service of God, and that service must appear as a splendid and adventurous thing; by no other means can the child have a right view of prayer.

The pupil will have a deeper appreciation of the meaning of worship if he knows something of its history — of the perilous meetings in woods and catacombs, of the mellow centuries of monastic piety, of the building of the cathedrals, the gracious

tradition of English Church music, so happily revived to-day, the ardour of Puritans and the devout retrospection of the Oxford Movement.

Besides definite teaching directed towards equipping the child for intelligent participation in worship, there are countless incidental opportunities for the teacher to make cross-references between school worship and the Scripture lesson. A passage read at Prayers can be discussed afterwards in the classroom. If a season, such as Whitsun, is to be marked by a special service, discussion and explanation beforehand will contribute to a better appreciation.

No one would pretend that a Christian spirit can be manufactured by the performance of ceremonies, or that the beauty of a well-conducted service necessarily proves the existence of such a spirit. Nevertheless, if we believe worship to be a vehicle of Divine Grace, we may expect such religious consciousness as there is in a school to grow by suitable exercise and expression. To this end it is most important that the various aspects of religious education, worship, instruction, and the general 'tone' of the school life, should not fall apart from one another, but should be held together in such a way that the life of the school is focussed upon the Christian purpose. The headmaster has a unique responsibility and opportunity for promoting and preserving this coherence of purpose, especially in the Elementary School, where his influence is usually more direct than in the Secondary School. In the Senior School the headmaster might well follow the example of Sanderson of Oundle, by regularly meeting a fairly large number of his older boys for teaching and discussion on very general lines, touching on current economic and social problems, matters to do with the conduct of the school itself, and even on questions of personal hygiene, as well as on religious issues. In this way he could promote a closer confidence between himself and his boys, and lead them to a more integrated view of life both within and without the school.

RELIGION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By C. F. Russell, B.D., Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School, Crosby; formerly Assistant Master at Harrow, and Headmaster of King Edward VI School, Southampton.

I HAVE read a considerable number of papers at past Conferences of Modern Churchmen, but I have never approached my subject with greater hesitation and diffidence than I do this year. There are several reasons which make it a difficult one to treat satisfactorily. In the first place there is the difficulty of the thing—religious education—itself. The schoolmaster's task of promoting true religion among his boys is one of his heaviest responsibilities; and inasmuch as religion is an activity of the whole boy or man, and not merely an affair of the mind, the problem is ultimately concerned with the mysterious thing we call personal influence, and that is not an easy matter to speak about or to discuss at a conference. But apart from the essential difficulty of the problem in itself, there are at least two things which, as it seems to me, often render its discussion less profitable than it might be: (1) the fact that any educational subject seems to have a peculiar attraction for the outside critic who has never been actively engaged in teaching anybody; and (2) the fact that it lends itself readily to being dealt with in terms of sonorous platitudes, which are impressive to the ignorant but of little practical value to other people.

In this country we set a high value upon expert knowledge and skill in many of the departments of life. The doctor, the chemist, the lawyer, the engineer, the astronomer, the seaman are all assumed to understand what they are doing; and, to glance at a different field of activity, the same may be said about the professional billiard-player, the lawn-tennis coach, or the goal-keeper of a football league team. No ordinary person, who was a layman in such matters, would ever venture to instruct any one of them as to how his particular job should be done. But in education it is different. There it is popularly supposed that everybody, from the successful business man to the fond parent, is qualified to express an opinion as to what the schools ought to do and how they ought to do it. One of the results of

this amateur invasion of the field of education is just what might be expected. It is comparatively easy to make statements about the final goal, so these are plentifully supplied; meanwhile the problem of getting there, which is decidedly complex, is less adequately dealt with. 'What we need in education,' one critic announces cheerfully, 'is the development of the personality.' Another remarks, 'Many of the subjects taught in schools are so much waste of time; what they ought to do with a boy is to teach him to think.' Or a third says, 'In my business I don't need a boy who has learnt Latin or chemistry: I want someone who keeps his eyes open, who realises the importance of accuracy, and who will do what he is told.' It is very much as if I were to say to the captain of a great liner, 'Your task is simple enough. All you have to do is to transfer this ship from one side of the Atlantic to the other.' Or to a doctor, 'You look puzzled about this patient, but *I* can tell you what to do. You have just got to restore him to a condition of sound physical health.'

But it would not be fair to suggest that the treatment of educational subjects in this platitudinous way comes only from one quarter. The outside critic is, indeed, more likely than the practical schoolmaster to take refuge in it, perhaps for lack of other things to say; but the practical schoolmaster is certainly not exempt from the danger, and I must be on my guard. In speaking of religious training in secondary and public schools, how am I to avoid saying over again what has already been said a hundred times, and also to avoid platitudes and unhelpful truisms? It has seemed to me that my most useful contribution would be made, not by attempting any full discussion of the question in schools generally, but by endeavouring to tell you, in considerable detail, some of the things that I try to do myself and some of the conclusions to which I have come in my own work. My paper will thus lose in dignity, and will deal in part at least with what may seem trivial things. But it may possibly contain here and there some hint or suggestion which will be of use to other people engaged, like myself, in a task as difficult as it is important. While I hope that there may emerge some general priniciples which will commend themselves to your approval, I must offer my apologies to the Conference Com-

mittee if this paper is completely off the lines on which they had desired that it should run.

What are the special occasions, in the life of a school, for religious training? I say *special* occasions because I do not wish to spend time on the answer which might otherwise be given—that, inasmuch as religion is concerned with the whole of life, the whole life of the school ought to be regarded as such an opportunity. That there is an element of truth in this statement need not be denied. The teacher of history can so teach history that it may be perceived that whatsoever a nation soweth that (in the long run) shall it also reap. The teacher of mathematics can so teach mathematics that it may be recognised that great is truth and mighty above all things. The teacher of any subject whatever can exhibit himself as one who, working with all diligence, adds to his knowledge self-control, and to his self-control patience. And so on. None the less, I do not regard this answer as very helpful. It is, to me, one of those platitudes, high-sounding, impressive to the outsider, certain to evoke approval in a popular audience, which leave us pretty near to where we were before. I wish, therefore, to consider the special occasions for religious training in school life, rather than to contemplate everything in school life under that aspect.

The occasions which require our attention are obviously the scripture lessons, on the one hand, and on the other the services for worship and devotion like school prayers and chapel services. I do not propose to deal at length with Confirmation, because that is not a peculiar feature of school religious training, but belongs just as much, or more, to parochial work. I content myself with one observation. Those who advocate a later age for confirmation, say sixteen or seventeen, are sometimes answered with the statement that if boys are not confirmed early most of them will probably not be confirmed at all, for before they reach the older age they will very likely have drifted away out of touch with parochial organizations. Whatever truth there is in this reply, it certainly cannot apply to the case of boys who remain at school till the age of sixteen at least; and if it is otherwise desirable (as I myself think it is) for confirmation to be administered later, secondary and public schools provide an opportunity for it to be so.

In regard, then, to the two matters of scripture lessons and school services, I do not know whether there will be general agreement with me on this point, but I wish to state my own view that it is the latter, rather than the former, which ought to be the more effective things for religion. Not that the scripture lessons are of no value; on the contrary, their value is considerable, but it is to my mind mainly of a different sort. Provided that the teaching is given by men and women who treat the Bible with both reverence and intelligence, it can hardly fail to impress its lessons, in respect of both conduct and belief, on those who are taught; but its chief purpose, I think, is to do what its name implies—to impart a knowledge of the Bible itself. At the present time this is very greatly needed. Actual knowledge of the contents of the Bible, even in its main outlines, is almost non-existent to-day among a large part of the population, including those people who are ranked as educated. It is perhaps just sufficient to enable them, or a few of them, to obtain the answers to the clues of cross-word puzzles which describe Syria as the land from which a leper went to be healed, or say of the word 'den' that it is a European country without an evangelist. But beyond this most people cannot get very far, and I expect we have most of us observed that even boys and girls who are good at their work, who come from religious homes, and who are pupils at schools where the religious side of the training is by no means neglected, are as a rule far less familiar with the contents of the Bible than would have been the case a generation ago. I believe that this state of things is one of the results of that prominent tendency in modern education to eliminate as far as possible the troublesome element, and to test whatever puts forward a claim to be included in the curriculum by asking whether its interest and value are such as can be at once perceived by the child—a tendency which I deplore. It does not, in my opinion, make proper use of the fact that childhood, when the memory is quick and retentive, is for that very reason the time when the mind has its chance of becoming equipped with the knowledge of facts which will be needed afterwards, but which it will be more difficult then to acquire.

When one's mind is dealing with familiar material some of the mental processes seem almost mechanical. The man, for

example, who has to add up a column of figures works not only more rapidly, but also more accurately, when he does not have to stop to think; as a schoolmaster friend of mine used to say, if when he was adding up marks at the end of term he had to stop to consider whether seven and nine did or did not make sixteen, it meant that his brain was not functioning properly and that he had done enough for the day. In any subject the possibility of advanced work depends a good deal upon the extent to which the earlier and simpler processes have become matters of almost unconscious routine. But this ease of working depends more than many of us realise on our becoming familiar at an early stage with operations and facts of which the value is not immediately apparent. Education certainly includes as one of its most important elements the training of the reasoning powers; but I regard it as one of the silliest of heresies to think that it is not also concerned to furnish the mind with a good deal of material to which the reasoning powers cannot at once be applied. There is a danger, I feel sure, of a theory of education becoming accepted by which we shall try to teach people to reason without giving them anything to reason about. It is not difficult, as we survey the modern world, to discover a disposition to argue without data, and to ignore the importance of hard facts. I do not want to see this disposition encouraged by our educational methods, and I consider that there is nothing degrading or uneducational in learning a good many facts of which one cannot oneself see at the moment what use will be made in reasoning at a later stage.

I must not pursue this criticism in its general application, but I will relate it again to my subject this morning. The tendency of which I have been speaking has certain watchwords or battle-cries, which you will recognise. In history, don't bother much about dates; in geography, don't learn lists of names; and so on. The particular battle-cry, in the case of scripture teaching, is don't worry the children with the kings of Israel and Judah. The piece of Old Testament history which is thus selected for special depreciation is a good example for my purpose. The actual formula may take the shape of ridiculing the learning of lists of royal names, but what is implied is that the history of the kings is of little importance and should not be

inflicted upon helpless children, and to this view I cannot subscribe. There is no question here as to the greater importance for religion of the study of the Old Testament prophets. That is a truth which is well on the way to becoming a truism. But, not to stress the point that a certain maturity of mind is a necessary qualification for the study of abstract moral teaching rather than lively incident, it cannot surely be disputed that the teaching of the prophets requires the background of the history to make it fully intelligible. Let me try to make my meaning clearer by an illustration from my own work. I frequently discuss with an Upper Fifth or Lower Sixth Form—that is to say, with boys of about sixteen or seventeen—the gradual development of the conception of God in the Old Testament. (Incidentally, I may suggest to you that that study forms an important avenue of approach to the Christian doctrine of the divinity of Christ.) Some of the fascinating and instructive chapters to be dealt with in the study of that development are those which have to do with Elijah and Ahab and the Phoenician alliance, with the revolution of Jehu and the part played in it by the prophets, with the reign of Jeroboam II and the contemporary prophets Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jonah, with the reformation in the reign of Josiah. The pre-monarchic history supplies, in the same way, useful material in connexion with such persons as Deborah, Ehud, Jephthah. Can you imagine that the discussion of such a subject will have its full value where there is no previous knowledge of the course of the Old Testament history; when the persons referred to are not recognized, or, if recognized, are not 'placed'; where the pupils have scarcely heard of Omri and Ahab and Jehu, and know very little about Elijah? And if the theologically argumentative study of the Old Testament cannot profitably be undertaken at an earlier age, is that any reason why acquaintance with the principal historical facts should not be gained in readiness for the philosophising that will come later?

You will now, I hope, understand what is in my mind, even if you do not agree with me, when I state the view that the purpose of scripture lessons, at any rate in lower and middle school forms, is primarily to teach a knowledge of the Bible, and only, as it were, indirectly and incidentally to give religious training. The highest forms are certainly in a different case,

and it is possible with them to discuss religious problems quite definitely—problems like the meaning of inspiration, the Lordship of Christ, the Atonement, the theistic interpretation of the world, the problem of pain, immortality; but the possibility and the importance of such work are sufficiently obvious, and do not need to be elaborated here. I pass on, therefore, to say something about school services for devotion and worship, in which, rather than in the scripture lessons (except for the older boys) I see the principal opportunity for religion.

It is an immense advantage to a school to possess a chapel, with all that it can offer of suggestion and helpfulness to the spirit of worship. In the great majority of schools, however, a chapel is out of the question, but many people besides myself can testify from their own experience that services and prayers conducted in the school hall can be real occasions of religious devotion. Indeed, in one respect at any rate, I am not sure that the advantage is not on the side of the latter, for the use of the hall may help to emphasize the fact that religion ought not to be a separate department of school life. I believe that the effect of the morning services is gradual and cumulative, and to a large extent unconscious; but in the long course of a boy's time at school it may be very great, and before he leaves he may have come to associate some of the holiest and most sacred moments in his inner life with this short daily exercise of corporate worship. I say a *short* exercise, and I would emphasize my conviction that the effect of school prayers does not depend upon their length—except in the wrong way. In my own practice as a Headmaster for the last fifteen years I have usually had no more than a hymn, a short reading, and a couple of prayers followed by the Lord's Prayer and the Grace. Prayers at the end of the day's work are not always possible in a day school, on account of difficulties of organization; but for ten years out of the eleven I spent at Southampton we had them on four days a week, and they were shorter still—a hymn, the Grace, and that was all.

Of the need for reverence in the conduct of the service, and for care and intelligence in the choice of hymns, there can be no need to speak: anything like formality or perfunctoriness will certainly be fatal. In regard to the readings, let me urge

that they should not be taken exclusively from the Bible; extracts from other literature—prose and poetry, English and foreign, modern and ancient—though they may be chosen less frequently, should, I think, be included from time to time. It has been my own custom to let the prepositors or monitors of the school read at morning prayers twice a week, and not merely to read but also themselves to choose what they read. Their tendency in selection has varied: some of them habitually read from the Bible, others almost as regularly do not; but it is very seldom indeed that an unsuitable choice is made—perhaps I have observed it half a dozen times in twice as many years. Let me add that I do not consider only those readings to be suitable which have some reference to religion in the narrower sense. Anything that inspires, or encourages, or sets the chords of the spirit vibrating, anything that helps us to see truth and love and beauty more clearly, anything, in short, that 'lifts up our hearts' seems to me to justify its choice; and I believe that the influence of the passage read on those who listen to it is all the greater in so far as they know that the senior boys are not just reading something that has been prescribed by authority, but something that they have chosen for themselves.

I have been speaking, of course, of prayers on ordinary days. On special occasions they will naturally be somewhat longer. As regards addresses, I will only remark that my own preference is to give them irregularly, just when the day, or the passage read, or the hymn suggests its fitness, rather than to have a rule like: 'There will be an address at prayers on Tuesdays.'

To the chapel services on Sundays, where they are held—and that will be for the most part in boarding schools—some of the same principles will apply. Their basis, I think, should be the ordinary shortened Mattins and Evensong, with a moderate but carefully limited use of special extra-liturgical prayers, plenty of singing, and not too rigid an adherence to the authorized lectionary and psalms, whether old or new. One sermon a day is the usual custom, and is quite enough, and it should be of the kind that is suited to an ordinary intelligent congregation rather than of any special character supposed to be peculiarly suitable to boyish tastes. Celebrations of Holy Communion, I feel, should be plain ones at eight o'clock; I cannot

for a moment regard an elaborate choral Eucharist as a suitable service to take the place of the ordinary morning service for the whole school.

Everyone knows that one of the most important elements in healthy school life is its corporate spirit. To have come to realise that one is a member of a community, sharing in its success or its failure, its glory or its disgrace, responsible in due measure for its well-being and its fair name—this is to have learned one of the greatest things that a school has to teach. It seems to me that this spirit is closely akin to the spirit of religion, or—if that is putting it too strongly—that at least the two act and react on one another in a very intimate way. It is to this aspect of my subject that I wish to devote the last part of my paper.

You do not make much progress towards the creation of this spirit by talking about it, but rather by providing opportunities through which, if the conditions are suitable, it will grow and develop spontaneously. And such occasions will not be those when the school is broken up into forms and divisions and societies and groups, for sectional activities, but those in which it acts as one body. To act corporately and to feel corporately are not the same thing, but for most people it is corporate action that makes corporate feeling possible. Hence comes the high importance of those occasions when a school is assembled as one body for whatever purpose—worship, entertainment, admonition, or an athletic contest. The most effective of all these, from this point of view, is, I believe, the assembling, day in and day out, for corporate worship; and here is one reason why I set school prayers so far above religious instruction in the form-room, as an instrument in religious training. One consequence of this fact—if fact it is—you will perceive at once. If the worship is to be a corporate experience of the whole school, it must be of a kind in which all, or practically all, *can* join. This does not raise any troublesome problem in schools where all the children belong to the same religious denomination; but such schools are a minority. The greater number, including both of those in which I have served as Headmaster, have no religious tests at admission, and are not permitted by their scheme of government to give religious teaching of a denominational kind. There is therefore in them no difficulty about Anglicans and Free Church-

men joining in the prayers together. Roman Catholics are sometimes withdrawn, but not always, and the same is true of Jews. From what I have said as to the importance of the worship being, so far as possible, that of the whole school, it will be evident that, apart from any regulations on the subject, I should myself always desire to have such a form of service as was acceptable to practically all the boys, and I certainly have not found the restriction an irksome one. Of the religious and Christian value of such a service I have no doubt at all. I am aware that some people will say, 'If you don't find it irksome not to be allowed to give definite church teaching, that can only be because you Broad Churchmen have nothing definite to teach.' It is not worth while to spend time on such objectors. I will content myself with stating, briefly but emphatically, that they are ill-informed in matters of fact, and that what they say is not true.

In order to give opportunity for the exercise of the feeling of social responsibility on a wider field than that which the school itself provides, it is of great value to have some kind of school mission, such as the running of a boys' club. In this connexion there are two or three principles which I believe are of great importance, and which are often neglected. In the first place, the primary object to be kept in view is not the magnitude of the work done, but the fact that as far as possible the boys do it. It is their service of a personal kind that is wanted, rather than their money. A sixth form boy who gives up one evening every week or fortnight to help in it is doing far more to promote the real purpose of the mission than one who merely subscribes, however large his subscription. It is a temptation with many efforts of this kind to let the work grow and develop till it reaches such a magnitude of organization that most of the work has to be done by others, and the boys' part is not much more than to provide the financial equipment. When this is so, I feel that as a school mission it is failing in its object, and it is no compensation, in my judgment, to be able to point to its greater effectiveness as a social force. It is not in its character as a social force on the slum boy, but as an educational force on the boy in the school, that there is found its *raison d'être*. And there is another reason for resisting its undue growth in size and expense. However much the actual work is done by

members of the school or by old boys, expense up to a certain point there is bound to be. But it is very important that the income required should not be so large that when appeals for contributions are made to the boys they become, in fact, appeals to the parents. For one thing, no school has the right to add to the already heavy expenses of parents a demand on behalf of a school charity. But secondly, even if the parents were all willing and eager to give, I should consider that the collection had failed in so far as the parents had contributed instead of the sons. When I ask the boys to give to such a collection, I want their gifts to be their own, and to cost them something in self-denial; I don't want them just to go home and say to their fathers, 'Give me ten bob for the school mission.' I would always rather have a gift of five hundred shillings from five hundred boys than five hundred guineas from their parents.

But further, corporate membership, whether of a school or a church, means more than the recognition of links sideways; it also means the recognition of those that lead forward or back. And for this, too, a school often offers a great opportunity. The history and tradition of the school, the lives and achievements of its old boys, all the stories connected with its past—not merely in the last two or three generations, but, where possible, going back through the centuries—these, as they become familiar, help immensely to the realization of what is meant by membership of a society that is greater than any of its individual members, a society that has endured and will continue to endure when they are gone. It is part of the furnishing of a full human life to feel the immeasurable debt that one owes to the past, and the responsibility that one owes to the future—to feel it with gratitude and also with humble pride. Many schools are of modern foundation, and in their case the school itself can only provide the material for teaching this lesson in a diminished degree. But I am convinced that, where it can do more, the possibility ought to be utilised to a much greater extent than is often done. Let me drive this home by an illustration from my old school of King Edward VI at Southampton. Among the famous men who were taught there, three at least made notable contributions to our devotional literature. One, Dr. Edward

Reynolds, Bishop of Norwich, was the author of the General Thanksgiving in the Book of Common Prayer; one, Dr. Isaac Watts, was one of the greatest of English hymn-writers, and his 'O God, our help in ages past,' may almost be called our national hymn; a third, Bishop Richard Mant, wrote many hymns, including that fine one which begins 'Bright the vision that delighted once the sight of Judah's seer.' About twelve years ago we dedicated the School War Memorial. At the service of dedication we sang 'O God, our help,' of course, as has been done I suppose, at the dedication of most of the war memorials throughout the country, but *we* sang it knowing that our School had given it to the English people. We said the General Thanksgiving together, and we knew that it was our School that had given them that noble prayer. And we sang a hymn of Richard Mant's, knowing that that had come from us as well. Can you realise, I wonder, the added intensity that was brought into the service by these things—a service which at no other school in England could have been quite the same? Can you imagine anyone being present and not being helped to set a greater value upon the heritage which he had received from the past, or to realise more clearly that the past and the present were indissolubly joined?

But apart altogether from the links provided by a school itself, I believe that a great deal can be done by making fairly frequent use of anniversaries of the most miscellaneous kind in connexion with school prayers; and this applies also, if I may venture to say so, though it is outside my subject, to ordinary parochial church services. A hymn acquires an added interest, and ceases to be merely 'Number so-and-so,' if it is sung on the birthday or deathday of the writer. (Perhaps it is worth reminding you that some modern hymn-books, like *Songs of Praise*, contain many poems which were not originally written as hymns, so that we can now, if we choose, commemorate in this way men like Tennyson and Browning, Clough and Kingsley, Lowell and Holmes, Kipling and Bridges, as well as Cowper and Milton and George Herbert and Keble.) Readings from the great poets or prose-writers are specially interesting on their anniversaries; and there are other ways in which their writings can be used—

for instance, you can say at the appropriate date, 'It is so many years to-day since Robert Louis Stevenson died, and so we will use one of the prayers that he wrote for his household in Samoa.'

I do not wish, however, to be thought to have none but literary anniversaries in my mind. We may commemorate statesmen, scientists, explorers, philosophers, teachers; or, again, historical events, landmarks in discovery, achievements in the progress of civilization, acts of heroism. It is often possible to give to a familiar hymn fresh point and significance by singing it on an anniversary to which it is specially appropriate. For instance, 'Lord of all being throned afar, Thy glory flames from sun and star,' on a day that commemorates Newton, or Kepler, or Galileo, or Herschel; 'Eternal Father, strong to save,' on the anniversary of some great triumph of navigation in the sixteenth century, or of some heroic incident in the annals of the life-boat; 'Awake, my soul' or 'Glory to Thee, my God, this night,' on the date of the Trial of the Seven Bishops, of whom, you remember, Ken was one; 'Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,' on some date connected with the anti-slavery movement or with the lives of Wilberforce or Abraham Lincoln; 'From Thee all skill and science flow,' in commemoration of some great invention or scientific discovery—these are just a few illustrations to which you will easily add others for yourselves.

Do you question the bearing of all this on religion? If so, let me say once more that the connexion is psychological rather than logical. In itself, of course, it is of no importance to know the date of the rounding of the Cape of Good Hope, or the birthday of Sir Isaac Newton, or the death-day of Abraham Lincoln or Sir Thomas Browne, nor indeed will the dates themselves be remembered. But I believe that the introduction of this anniversary element into school prayers does definitely help to create the feeling of solidarity; that it tends, gradually and unconsciously, to make many a boy realise what it means to be a member of a great society; that so there grows up in him that spirit of gratitude, and appreciation, and reverence, and obligation by which the corporate sense is enabled to grow and develop. After all, I need not apologise for the use of anniver-

saries in Christian teaching, speaking to you as I do on St. Bartholomew's Day, but I urge the far wider choice of such commemorations than can be provided for by ecclesiastical saints alone.

I said early in this paper that I was going to talk about details and apparently trivial things. I have now kept my word. But let me conclude by saying that to me these things are not really trivial at all. The process of education and training, of the formation of habit and of character, is not often accomplished by startling and dramatic steps; rather it is effected by slow degrees, quietly, secretly, like the other normal processes in nature. We cannot create the result at which we aim: we can only try, in all sorts of ways, to provide the conditions in which the Divine Spirit can operate. I hope that some of you may have found, among the things of which I have spoken, a hint or two that may be suggestive, and that you can utilize for that high purpose yourselves.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN SUNDAY SCHOOL AND BIBLE CLASS

By the Rev. J. P. Hodges, M.A.

IT is now a century and a half since Robert Raikes spent sleepless nights over the Church's neglect of the children of his city, and, as a result, opened the first Sunday School in Gloucester. From small beginnings, the movement spread rapidly and widely, so that to-day it would be difficult to find any Church without some form of Sunday School work. On the side of theory, a corresponding advance has been made, and the quantity of literature available on problems of youth and of youth organizations is so great that one is tempted sometimes to wonder what would happen if some modern Raikes were stirred to activity over the neglected middle-aged!

Many of the problems with which the early pioneers of Sunday School work were faced have either vanished or they have been transformed out of recognition. There was the attitude which regarded the poor as necessarily depraved and vicious, and which therefore condemned Sunday Schools for casting pearls before swine—with the insinuation, born of the French Revolution, that they would prove to be Gadarene swine. To-day, the same attitude would question whether any pearls which the Sunday Schools have to offer could be real ones. Again, to-day, the Sunday School must be complementary to the Day School and must bear in mind the efficiency of the Day School standards. The early Sunday School, however, held the field of elementary education. It offered instruction in a four-square gospel of reading, writing, arithmetic and religious knowledge. Children brought their Sunday dinner with them, and remained in church from 10 a.m. until after 3 o'clock Evensong—a feat of endurance which was restricted by one bishop, who suggested that for children who had been engaged in indoor work during the week, four hours' instruction would suffice! Even among children, there were giants in those days!

But there is one difficulty which we share in common though its circumstances have changed. It is the insularity of the adult mind. Organized essentially as an adult society, the Church has found it difficult to recognize or appreciate the world of childhood. In Raikes' day that world was almost entirely neglected, not only in religion, but also in poetry and literature. The writer who advised that children should be kept from 'reading feigned fables, vain fantasies and wanton stories, and songs of love which bring much mischief to youth,' was typical of his day in stressing the things a child should not do and neglecting anything more positive. A series of writers from R. L. Stevenson to A. A. Milne has made amends in literature and won the parents; but in religion the majority of church-goers have still to be converted. The difficulty of obtaining Sunday School teachers as well as that of securing adequate Sunday School finance are but symptoms of this tendency to regard religion and religious services as only for adults. At best, the presence of children in church is tolerated, and the uneasiness (often unconscious) with which their presence is regarded transfers itself to them. 'Suffer the little children to come unto Me,' said our Lord. 'Let them come,' said Tertullian, 'when they are grown up.' So the Church welcomes the infant at Baptism and then puts it into cold storage until it is grown up. The Sunday School is the cold storage.

It is time that we brought child education to the very forefront of our Christian programme. If our ideals concerning truth and beauty are to be realized, it is our children and our children's children who will bring this to pass. If they grow up neglected or but tolerated by the Church, then not only will they become indifferent, but they will be captured by other movements. Sunday School education is eminently worth-while because, with our modern knowledge, our improved methods and our renewed vision, we have a wonderful opportunity of helping the child. Even in these days when finance is so pressing, the work of the Sunday Schools should be the last place where expense is pitted against efficiency, and the Church which practises this false economy is digging its own grave.

It has been said that if you wish to educate a child aright you must begin with his grandparents. At any rate, no one will dispute the statement that the life-process of education begins

at the beginning of that life, if not before it. A great deal of useful literature has been written around this early formative period to show how it can wisely be used in secular education. But it has a definitely religious significance too. We do well to think of education less in terms of instruction than of training—though of course the latter will include the former. By derivation, education means a process of nurture; and one of the first factors in this life-process is the important one of environment. Quite early in his life the baby begins to behave

> 'As if his whole vocation
> Were endless imitation';

and such imitation is his attempt to understand life by entering into the experiences of those around him.

The ideal home, of course, will offer the child an atmosphere of reverence and worship as well as the sense of beauty and happiness. Too often, however, the future member of the Sunday School is introduced into an atmosphere of superstition which deadens religion to a formality right at the beginning. To choose two examples, the services of Churching and of Holy Baptism have become little more than superstitious ceremonies which bring good luck or avoid bad luck. Churching should be a beautiful act of thanksgiving as well as a solemn recognition of a spiritual responsibility for the future of the child. Instead, it is a formula against bad luck to be repeated immediately upon coming out of hospital and before either eating bread or entering another's home. Baptism, instead of being a spiritual act of dedication and admission into a living fellowship, is the religious equivalent of vaccination, necessary to save the child from certain undefined but deadly perils. Also, it is unlucky for mother to see her own baby 'done,' and father does not usually wish to; it is lucky if baby cries at the moment of Baptism, hence baby is not fed before the ceremony, and, being starved, it cries all through the service—a fact which is certainly unlucky for the parson. So the child begins its spiritual life in the company of sponsors who will have no further say in its training and in an atmosphere which is the negation of real religion.

I believe that it is infinitely worth while for a parish priest to spend a good deal of time and trouble over the Churchings and

Baptisms which he conducts, in order to make them really impressive spiritual acts. If he can succeed thereby in evoking a religious as distinct from a superstitious atmosphere in the home, he will not only effect the first stage in the child's training, but he will lay a foundation on which the Sunday School can effectively build. Then a Cradle Roll can do valuable service by keeping the new member in touch with the great Fellowship in which he has been enrolled; and, if the Senior Bible Class or Department is given the task of shepherding these little ones until they can join the Kindergarten, they will respond to this environment and approach the Sunday School as a religious training ground. Incidentally, the 'awkward age' of the Senior Department will be given something to do to retain their interest, and the new 'sponsors' may prove more influential than the now meaningless god-parents.

This is neither the time nor the place, even if I were the person, to discuss the details of modern methods of Sunday School organization. In this respect, certainly, recent years have seen rapid strides towards efficiency. The help of both psychology and pedagogy has been invoked with considerable success and, to-day, nearly every diocese can offer its teachers much in the way of scientific training. Thus the amateurish nature of much Sunday School work in the past can and will be ameliorated in the future, and sentiment will be coupled with intellect and not divorced from it. I am not among those who decry the work of amateurs or who take too seriously the warnings of the psychologist as to the after-effects of inefficient teaching or misguided influence. Of course there is truth in these warnings. But if it were the only truth, then, as the result of an ignorant nurse, a sentimental governess, or an inefficient Sunday School teacher, we should all be suffering from such an array of repressions and complexes as to be virtually lunatics. Roman Catholicism, with its school system permeated by false methods and saturated with false doctrine, yet saved by the sacrificial devotion of its teachers, encourages me to believe that it is not always necessary to fear the worst. Our own Church has seen an equal amount of devotion on the part of its Sunday School teachers. All honour to their record and more power to their elbow!

At the same time, we live in a world where survival is to the fittest. Dr. Basil Yeaxlee, in his valuable book *The Approach to Religious Education*, reminds us that the present school generation takes for granted a world which for us is still so new that we are bewildered in it. But one generation and the new becomes the familiar! And when we remember that the characteristic feature of this new world is the scientific outlook which examines everything, the challenge of the situation is clear. If we are to keep pace with the times, our methods must be brought to the touchstone of science and psychology. This means that much more serious attention must be given to the methods of the graded Sunday School. It stands for efficiency and, in Christian education, this is a spiritual thing. I believe that in the graded Sunday School lies the possibility of providing the new atmosphere for the new world and thus of fostering that nurture which is the object of education.

There will always be some controversy over the subject-matter suitable for child education. We have, I hope, passed the day when it was believed that it does not much matter what you teach children as long as they dislike it. I would urge, however, that a pressing duty of the Church in revising its teaching material is to get rid of its dogmatic Catechism. It is not merely that its language is out of date, its phraseology abstruse and its theology questionable; these things might be put right by revision. But its whole system is wrong. It attempts to couple the outlook of the child with the understanding of the man, with the result that its repetition produces habit-memory of an unmeaning kind. In effect, it revises our Lord's words and says to the children, 'Except ye become little adults ye cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.' The aim of all educational methods should be not to produce little adults, but to train growing personalities. There is a place in our Sunday School for repetition, especially if the subject-matter be carefully chosen with a view not only to a later understanding, but also to its being worth while understanding. But, as far as possible, it should be of the kind that appeals to pure memory which remembers because it understands. Habit memory may be useful in learning multiplication tables and French verbs, but in religious education it is to a large extent a waste of time. It merely produces the type

of child who believed that God's name was Harold since he had always repeated the second petition of the Lord's Prayer in that way.

Will Sunday School teachers for ever be seeking for the *right* lesson book? The quest is a pitiful one and, for many, it is doomed to end in disappointment since they are looking for something which they ought not to find. A lesson book which attempted to provide material needing no adaptation by the teacher would not only have a very small range of suitability but would violate the first maxim of sound education that teaching must be mediated through the personality of the teacher. If he is to awaken appreciation and understanding in the scholar, he must first make the lesson his own. At the same time, the insistent demand of teachers for a *story-book* has its point. Experience soon convinces the teacher that the child does not readily appreciate abstract principles or abstract ideals. Of course the experienced teacher will gradually expand the interest of the scholars; but most of the older lesson books were too homiletical and their attempt to transfer ready-made wisdom and ready-made virture to the child was doomed to failure. But clothe those things in the form of a story which captures the interest and appeals to the imagination and the child will draw the right moral for itself. The story is the natural method of teaching and therefore it is the most effective one. It is significant that of the perfect Teacher it is recorded that 'without a story spake He not unto them.'

Subject-matter for teaching must be graded so as to appeal successively to the imagination, to hero-worship, and only later more definitely to the faculty of reasoning. But here a difficulty arises which will evoke many opposing views. Should we tell the children Bible-stories whose literal truth and accuracy we do not ourselves accept? Personally, I am not convinced about the tragedy of children having to unlearn their early teaching. Truth, after all, is a progressive thing, and if the training of the child takes into account that progression, then the child will not have so much to unlearn as to advance towards a deeper meaning. At the height of its imaginative period the child loves fairy tales and legends. It asks, not 'Is it true'? but 'Is it interesting?' Later comes the period when experience of what is and

what is not probable begins to ripen, and myth and legend are recognized as such. But the child is not broken-hearted over the discovery that Santa Claus does not come with a team of reindeer and enter by the romantic passage of the chimney; rather, he still welcomes the new Santa Claus, because he accepts the disguise as symbolism suggesting the care and love of his parents. Thus he can pass quite naturally from truth of fact to truth of meaning.

Hence the criterion by which I should judge the stories told to Kindergarten and Primary Schools is not whether they are true in fact and detail, but whether they will awaken the right kind of emotional response. If, for example, the stories are such as to appeal to fear or vengeance, or if they represent God as an officious Policeman, then they are harmful. But if they stimulate reverence and wonder, there will be nothing to unlearn later on. The trouble with many lesson-books is that they fail to pay sufficient attention to the next stage when the growing child does find difficulties of interpretation and when he asks, 'Is this story really true?' This is the age during which a teacher's sympathetic understanding will help the child to appreciate the difference between the truth of fact and the truth of meaning. It is also the time for helping him to see something of the progressive nature of revelation; and nothing is more important than to help the child to regard the Bible less as an inspired book than as a library to which many have contributed according to the light and measure of their inspiration. If ever we are to make 'Bible-Christians' of our scholars, it will be by enabling them to appreciate the interest of the Bible itself and not by stimulating an artificial respect for the Bible. The ultimate effect of the latter is to place the Bible in an honourable place beneath the aspidistra, where its Delphic oracles remain unchallenged because unknown.

It has been said that 'the weakest point in the whole Sunday School system is the method of teacher-production.' Perhaps it is here too that most modernist clergy find the greatest difficulty. Graded Sunday Schools and up-to-date methods may sound well; but if you cannot get the *right* teachers, what is the use of it all? Certainly a school in which teachers come when they like, and teach what they like and how they like, is of little use in a

general process of training; its obvious weaknesses account for not a little in producing the nominal 'C. of E.' parishioner. Yet I should be reluctant to abandon the method of the Sunday School. I believe that a great deal of casualness could be remedied if more attention were paid by the clergy to the important question of the Preparation Class. 'Teachers,' said a pioneer of modern methods, a quarter of a century ago, 'are no more born than lawyers or doctors. There may be men born who have an aptitude for teaching, just as there are men who have a predisposition toward medicine or the law. There is nothing born in us but aptitude. Doctors must be trained and so must teachers' (G. H. Archibald, *The Sunday School of To-morrow*, p. 48). So I am convinced that the weekly or fortnightly Preparation Class is of the utmost importance. It is the transmission-shaft between the parson and the school, and, however busy he is, if he is wise, he will not leave it in other's hands without good reasons. A Preparation Class organized along the lines of a study and discussion group is invaluable. Here is the chance of sharing experience; here is the chance for the discussion of doubts and difficulties; here is the opportunity for inculcating the true idea of directional training which will help to nurture rather than to surfeit the child. Where it is well planned and prepared it can be a delight to look forward to, instead of a weariness to be endured. The modernist parson cannot afford to neglect this important avenue.

Another thing which tends to spoil Sunday School teaching and to warp the outlook of the scholar is the lamentable lack of beauty in the usual schoolroom. The more we economize here, the more we pay for it elsewhere. Cinemas, public parks and even public-houses to-day have a magnificence which must often seem luxurious to the poor. But too often, the scholar enters Sunday School to find a dreary building with the paint or whitewash falling from the walls; he is given a black-bound and unattractive Bible with many loose pages adding to its untidiness; he listens to a harmonium wheezing out an inglorious harmony; and then he is asked to sing, 'All things bright and beautiful.' Small wonder that he learns to recognize beauty but slowly, and that when he does so he rarely associates it with God. And to this unaesthetic appeal is added the harmful effect of

tawdry and misleading pictures. In teaching, the visual impression plays an equally important part with the spoken word; but in most of the larger pictures used for this purpose, mawkish sentiment vies with an atrocious colour-scheme to destroy all educative value. It will be a great day for the Church when it can find the artist with spiritual vision who will spend heart and soul in producing a series of really good pictures which will convey beauty as well as truth to the child mind.

All of this plays its part in that aspect of education which concerns training in worship. This important field is sometimes neglected because of a belief that the child cannot appreciate the experience of real worship; hence all that can be expected is that discipline may accustom the child to the form of service, leaving him to fill it with meaning later. I do not agree with this. I believe, as Miss Wilson states in *Child Psychology*, that although there is obviously a difference between child worship and adult worship, 'The evidence is overwhelming that worship is a natural instinct and experience of childhood' (p. 118). To develop this calls for all the art of the leader. He will find out by experiment what particular aspect of beauty appeals to the children; he will arrange the details of room and service so as to give the suggestion of reverence; he will choose hymns which combine simplicity of thought with beauty of language. Thus he will provide a form of prayer and praise relative to the children's needs and to their stage of mental development, and, in doing so, he will offer an environment of worship in which children prove quickly responsive.

Education is a life-process which continues through and after the Sunday Schools with the changing needs of the growing personality. The usual Bible-class age coincides with the period when the reasoning faculty comes into prominence; hence the method of training must be adapted. If the teacher does all or even most of the talking, the class will either 'play him up' or subside into somnolence. This period provides the opportunity for training by discussion, in which the teacher will guide and direct while the class will be 'self-educators.' Some will prefer to be silent listeners, though even so their thought is provoked by the contributions which others are making. Doubts and difficulties are more freely voiced in such a class and the leader has

a real opportunity of giving guidance. He need not be alarmed if opinions expressed seem crude or biassed. I remember being first a little disturbed at the violent and un-Christian views of a youth expressed in a Sunday afternoon discussion, and then, a month later, being secretly amused at hearing the same youth repeat as his own most of the arguments which had told against him. It was not insincerity; he had grown in intelligence. Religion comes to mean more when crude ideas, imperfect conceptions and perhaps a thinly-disguised agnosticism are examined and shown in their true perspective. It stands to gain rather than lose by the candid examination of belief; and, what P. T. Thomson calls 'the kindly trepidation of our elders lest the acquisition of knowledge should cool the soul's ardour' is unfounded.

And this 'self-educative' school can promote education in other senses than the mere acquisition of knowledge. Some of the most inspiring services which I have attended have been those organized and conducted by the young people themselves. Here is a service of music drawn up and conducted by the prefects of a Young People's Guild; my part consisted only in choosing the lesson and giving a short address on worship.

Orchestra: 'Water Music' - - - - - - *Handel.*
Prologue: 'I love all beautiful things' - - - *Bridges.*
Hymn: 'Praise the Lord'
Prayers.
Lesson: *Ecclesiasticus* 1, 17-24.
Orchestra: 'Sarabande' - - - - - - *Bach.*
Song: 'To Music' - - - - - - - *Schubert.*
Piano: 'Little Litanies of Jesus' - - - - *Grovlez.*
Hymn: 'Here in the Country's heart'
Address.
Song: 'The Music Makers' - - - - *Shaughnessy.*
Hymn: 'In this world, this Isle of Dreams'
Blessing.
Orchestra: March from 'Occasional Overture' - - *Handel.*

This expression of worship through poetry, music and song was well done and well appreciated. Not every Guild, of course, has the necessary equipment for such a service, nor would all appreciate it; but at least it shows the sort of thing which is possible.

Another valuable sphere of work is the Study Circle or Discussion Group, and since it is more informal and appeals to those who have emerged from adolescence, it affords opportunities for a more particularized study of the truths of the Christian religion. A course spread over several weeks offers more chances of regular attendance than one given on consecutive evenings in a week. Also, those forming the group have time to think things out and thus to prepare for the next week's talk. In fact, one of the things for which I have often been asked at such groups is an outline of the following week's lecture in order that 'we may know something about it first.' The meetings usually consist of a lecture lasting from thirty to forty minutes, a quarter of an hour's interval for light refreshments and then thirty to forty minutes' discussion of set questions by small groups, followed by the presenting of reports by the group leaders and a general summary by the lecturer. I have been amazed at the enthusiasm which this form of Study-circle can foster. The difficulty is not to provoke discussion but to terminate it in reasonable time! I am convinced that along lines similar to these mentioned above, we have the opportunity of building the foundations of an educated Churchmanship.

In this paper, I have stressed the term 'life-process' in connection with education: for if education is 'growth in truth as it is in Jesus,' then it cannot be confined to any period or periods of life. Hence, it follows that if we are training the child and the youth in a conception of religion which includes truth and beauty as well as goodness, then these things must not be denied or belittled in the ordinary services of the Church. Unless both our preaching and our conduct of the services are governed by those same standards of sincerity and sympathy by which we try to train our children, we are asking them to unlearn in church what we have taught them in the schools. A Church divided against itself cannot stand. It is no mean objective, therefore, for the Modernist to make a Church worthy for children to worship in: 'for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.'

THE CHARACTER AND CALL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN RELATION TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM

By the Rev. W. W. Longford, D.D.

I.

THE topic appointed for this paper might be dealt with in more than one way. It would be possible, for example, to set out the ideals of Roman Catholicism on the institutional or on the devotional side and to compare and contrast these ideals with those normally adopted by the Church of England. The task laid upon the reader, however, is of another sort. It is desired that the present relationship of Roman Catholicism to the Church of England should be examined, and that illustration of that relationship should be given over as wide a field as the limits of this paper allow, not overlooking issues arising within the political sphere at home and abroad. This examination will be preceded by an outline of the historical development out of which the present situation has arisen; while subsequently the question will be asked what, in view of its character and call, the proper attitude of the Church of England should be. It is this last question which will lend itself best to the discussion which comes after the paper has been read, since the main purpose of the paper is to be informative as to the issues rather than dogmatic as to the formulation of policy.

Our first task therefore is to summarize the historical antecedents of the present situation. The Roman question in England is of no recent growth; it goes far back behind the period of the Reformation. The papalization of the English Church was achieved by force of arms at the Norman Conquest, which took the form of a Crusade against the English and their Church under the auspices of Alexander II. Apart from this papal alliance it is very doubtful whether William of Normandy could have succeeded in his designs upon England. The hallowing of the invasion under the terms of a Crusade brought a following

from France far larger than could have been drawn from Normandy. The conquest achieved, William had to implement his bargain with the Pope, and this he did very thoroughly. English bishops and abbots were displaced; the Church was denationalized, and set up as a separate corporation with courts of its own — soon to administer the papal canon law. It is true that the Conqueror was strong enough to insist that no Pope not acknowledged by himself should be obeyed in England, and that papal bulls should have no force apart from the Crown's consent. It is true also that he refused what was further demanded, homage to the Roman See. But Rome could afford to wait under the circumstances, and it had not very long to wait. Henry I and Henry II might each struggle in their turn with the sequelae of a situation for which the Conqueror was responsible. In 1213 John was forced to make terms and to deliver his crown and kingdom to the Papacy.

So England and Ireland became politically subject to the Pope, and England became the milk-cow of the Papacy. So also the jurisdiction of Rome became fully effective over the English Church until the reign of Henry VIII, though feudal submission was repudiated in that of Edward III. When in 1533 the English parliament declared in effect that 'the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England,' it was only taking away at the instance of one king shackles which had been secured at the instance of another; and when Rome makes capital out of the circumstances which were the occasion of renewed freedom, it should be remembered that what she lost through the morals of one king she had won through the vices of another.

The re-establishment of the Roman jurisdiction under Philip of Spain and Mary, with the re-enactment of the statutes for burning heretics, had no national support behind it. As Gardiner insists, the great majority of English people on the accession of Elizabeth would have been well pleased with a return to the system of Henry VIII, in complete disregard of the threats or warnings of the Pope. Final abolition of the Roman jurisdiction was carried through by Parliament early in 1559. Of the twenty-seven English sees, seven were vacant by death on Elizabeth's accession (November 1558), and four more, including the Archbishopric of Canterbury, by the close of the year. Of the sixteen

remaining bishops, all but one refused to accept the Act restoring the ancient jurisdiction of the Crown. Eight were therefore deprived during June and July, and the remainder between September and November of 1559. On the other hand, only 189 out of 9,400 other clergy refused to accept the restored Crown jurisdiction and the Book of Common Prayer. The deprived bishops for the most part were lodged and maintained by their successors —a course which was not pursued in France when the deprived bishops of the Revolution were left to their fate by the Pope when he set up a new episcopate by concordat with Napoleon.

It cannot be pretended however that the new order which finally emerged after the first twelve months or so of accommodation was universally acceptable. At one end of the nation was an active minority desiring greater conformity with continental types of Protestantism; at the other end there was another minority, very conservative in outlook, which was disaffected by the changes which had been brought about. This latter minority was located mainly north of the Trent in a relatively backward and scanty population, where feudalism had hardly yet broken down, and where tenants followed the lead of the landed proprietors. Elsewhere Sussex had the only considerable body of disaffected. This attitude was kept alive by agents specially empowered from Rome, and rebellion was raised in the north at the instance of Pius V, who sent a subsidy of 12,000 crowns to finance it. Up to the year 1570, nevertheless, the new church order was accepted however reluctantly by all parties, in the sense that the services and sacraments were frequented by all.

It was in the year 1570 that Roman Catholicism in England originated. At the command of Pius V by the Bull Regnans in Excelsis there was a breakaway from outward conformity on the part of all those who recognized the Papal claim to authority, and a schism began similar in character to that of the Non-jurors just over a century later. These nonconformists were called Recusants, Papists, and subsequently Roman Catholics. What their number was it is hard to say with accuracy, but the returns of 1603 gave it as 8,570 as against two and a half million conforming communicants. It is hardly likely that the number of Recusants was more than 10,000 in 1570, despite the fact that Pius V had put under anathema all those subjects of Elizabeth

who thereafter should obey her. 'Hitherto,' wrote Thomas Fuller, 'Papists generally without regret repaired to the public places of Divine Service, and were present at our prayers, sermons and sacraments . . . in outward conformity they kept communion with the Church of England. In which sense one may say that the whole land was of one language and one speech. But now (anno 1570) began the Tower of Babel to be built and Popery to increase . . . the Papists now separating themselves from our public congregations.'

I have thought it necessary to speak somewhat at length upon the situation existing before 1570 in order that the origins of the Roman jurisdiction may be clearly recognized, and that the confusions often found in the popular mind may be cleared up as to the relation existing between the Roman Catholic body in England and the pre-Reformation Church. Romanist apologists deliberately foster these confusions. They speak of an alien ministry thrust upon the Church, when in point of fact the clergy as a whole continued in their benefices. They speak of being robbed of their buildings. But the fact that the Roman jurisdiction was fully in force in the Church between the reigns of John and Henry VIII cannot be brought to imply that the Papacy had any property whatever in the buildings or endowments of the Church in England. The non-conforming minority created by the Pope in 1570 had no claim on either after their secession; and the Irish Romanists who form the major part of the modern Roman Catholic community have no vestige of a title. Cardinal Bourne, who not infrequently gives utterance to suggestions of this sort, is a victim of romantic fancy — in this as in other fictions which have considerable vogue.

It is not necessary to deal at all fully with the aggressive movements which followed Pius V's excommunication of Elizabeth and sentence of deposition. The general facts are well-known. A sustained policy, mainly directed by the Jesuits (who were often at loggerheads with the seminary priests from Douai and elsewhere), to capture the Crown, either by assassination or by conversion or by rebellion, was maintained for over 170 years. Penal laws which modern sentiment finds it hard to approve were from time to time savagely enforced by the State, and over three hundred priests and others were put to death in the earlier days,

not infrequently with horrible torture. In estimating the pertinence of the modern Roman Catholic advertisement of these cruel deaths, and the discovery that after two to three centuries it would help the cause by beatifying the victims, one has to consider what was going on under Papal auspices outside England. Not only was the revived Roman jurisdiction under Mary responsible for nearly three hundred deaths by burning in less than three years, but relatively to the outrages committed abroad which kept shocking the public consciousness during the period under discussion, the Romanists in England were well treated. That they suffered merely for their religion is a specious quibble: they suffered for real or suspected treason, and it was chiefly the well-grounded fear of Rome and of her persistent cruelty when in power which brought the unfortunate victims of her policy to the scaffold. Lecky in summarizing a number of outstanding outrages on the Continent continuing until after the middle of the eighteenth century says: 'These things will not be forgotten by a candid judge in estimating the policy of the English government.' The propaganda value of the English martyrs however is now very high, owing to the initiative of a convert from Anglo-Catholicism, and a Tyburn Walk now takes place annually from Newgate to Tyburn, thousands of pilgrims walking this 'Way of Sorrows.'

The position in England has throughout been complicated with the position in Ireland, where owing to political and racial hatreds reformation in the Church was singularly unsuccessful. A people once unwillingly forced to accept the papal hegemony as part of Henry II's reparation for the murder of Becket for the most part withstood any ecclesiastical change initiated by those whose ancestors had invaded the country under Papal grant. But though there has never been any very notable decrease of the Romanist population in Ireland, in England, after it became clear that there was but little chance of the restoration of the Stuarts, many of the old families which had remained obstinately recusant began to conform, and their dependents followed their example. The recusant clergy had been drawn very considerably from the younger sons of such families, educated abroad. The supply from this source gradually grew less and less. Romanism was still strong in the scanty population of Lancashire and parts

of Yorkshire at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. In London however it was mainly kept alive by the chapels attached to the foreign embassies. In 1778, among other things, Lord Savile's Act removed the legal ban upon the celebration of the Mass. By 1791 it had become so clear that the scanty remnant neither intended nor was capable of further mischief to the government that a Relief Act was passed. This was a consequence of an appeal, signed by the four papal Vicars Apostolic working in England and by practically all the Roman Catholic clergy, and presented to Parliament as the ground for relief. It stated among other things that the English Romanists did not acknowledge infallibility in the Pope, or that he had any jurisdiction or authority within this realm that can directly or indirectly affect or interfere with the independence, sovereignty, laws, constitution or government thereof, or the rights, liberties, persons or properties of the people. This declaration completely traversed the Papal Bull 'Regnans in Excelsis' which was the original cause of the English recusants' sufferings, and on the strength of it legal toleration was given to Roman Catholic worship and schools, under conditions many of which were gradually forgotten, and the last of which were legally removed in 1929.

From this point onwards Roman Catholicism in England becomes more and more part of the Irish problem. Lord Savile's Act had been extended to Ireland, and after 1778 Roman Catholic worship was no longer illegal in that country. In 1782 Protestant Ireland achieved legislative independence. This was ended by the Act of Union in 1800. From that date till 1829 we have the long drawn out struggle for Roman Catholic emancipation — that is, for the franchise and equality of civil rights. This would have come earlier in England but for the fears entertained of its political consequences in Ireland, having regard to the fact that a majority there would have power to register the will of a foreign potentate. Responsible Roman Catholic authorities in Ireland, with the peers and gentry, and all their co-religionists in England and Scotland were in favour of a Crown veto on the appointment of Roman Catholic bishops as a way out of this difficulty. A similar arrangement had been made by the concordat between Napoleon and the Papacy for the Church in France

Representatives of the Pope in 1808 and 1814 declared in favour of such veto. But the whole Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland, now being trained more and more at Maynooth and not abroad, led by O'Connell, withstood the arrangement as Erastian. Their agitation, continued year after year, led the country to the threshold of revolution, to avoid which emancipation was granted in 1829 and the veto abandoned.

In the meantime, in 1822, famine descended upon Ireland, vastly overpopulated as to its peasantry. A beginning was made of that emigration into England which created what is for the main part an Irish Roman Catholic Church in England. The dreadful recurrence of famine in 1845-6-7 brought in great floods of emigrants, and led to the establishment of Irish quarters in nearly all the ports and larger manufacturing towns. There were as yet very few of the English middle classes attached to Romanism. For such influx as there has since been the Oxford Movement is chiefly responsible.

The Oxford Movement was in inception a side-issue of the Irish question. The famous National Apostacy sermon which has been celebrated this year of centenary was occasioned by the action of the Reform Parliament in reducing the number of bishoprics in the Church of Ireland, united to that of England by the Act of Union in 1800. It is one of the ironies of history that among the chief consequences of the Movement in defence of the Church was the increase of the following of the Roman Catholic community just at the time when the Irish tide was beginning to flow strongly into England. The secession of Newman and others twelve years after the Movement began created a situation as unforeseen as it was unparalleled in English religious life during the past three centuries. Though this example was not followed subsequently by such numbers as were expected, it gave Rome an entrance to a social class which formerly had been outside its influence, and it is in the element provided by succeeding secessions that Roman Catholicism in England has found and still finds its most active agents in propaganda. Prior to the Oxford Movement, to the English at large Roman Catholics seemed 'not part of a vast organization . . . but an obscure, half-foreign and negligible sect' (Warre Cornish). The Oxford Movement and the Irish immigration have made Roman

Catholicism what it is now under the deft handling of Cardinals Wiseman, Manning and Vaughan, and last but certainly not least of Cardinal Bourne, whose leadership has marked a new epoch in the history of the community.

II.

Wiseman had early seen the advantage which was likely to accrue to Rome from the Oxford Movement. He was consecrated in 1840 by Gregory XVI, and for the next ten years used every opportunity open to him of drawing over converts. In 1850 the Pope created a Metropolitan see and appointed twelve territorial bishops, in place of the Vicars Apostolic who hitherto had been in charge of affairs in England. Wiseman, created Cardinal, became the first archbishop of Westminster, and issued from Rome a Pastoral emphasizing the blessing conferred upon England 'by the restoration of its true Catholic hierarchical government.' It is hard to realize to-day the sense of outrage that was manifested all over the country. But the battle was now set, and a situation hardly dreamed of at the time of enfranchisement twenty years before had become actual. The Roman body consecrated its activities to the conversion of England. Ultramontanism became the order of the day, though for the most part strongly opposed by Romanists of the older stock. But they were scorned and overridden by the Irish and the converted Anglicans. The same older element disapproved of the Infallibility decree of 1870. By this time however the newer element had the upper hand completely.

It is during the last thirty years however, which synchronize with the archiepiscopate of Cardinal Bourne, that the greatest advance has been made in the organization and public influence of the Roman Catholic Church in England. The Papal declaration upon Anglican orders in 1896 produced nothing like the landslide that had been anticipated — and anticipated so far that Leo XIII caused a Converts' Aid Society to be established to succour expected convert ministers. In the opening years of the present century there was little to indicate the development which has taken place in the last thirty years. But a number of factors have combined to assist the present Archbishop of Westminster in his adroit statesmanship.

(1) Before Bishop Bourne went to Westminster England was still a missionary sphere under the oversight of the Congregation of Propaganda at Rome. Five years after his preferment Pius X gave the Roman Catholic Church in England fuller powers of provincial government. There is an obvious and great advantage here.

(2) The Roman Catholic Church set up in France by Concordat between Napoleon Bonaparte and the Papacy was deprived of its status and its State-paid income at the beginning of the period, and its religious orders, many of them teaching orders, were dispersed. Many of these French religious orders came into England, and new Romanist centres were set up throughout the country which now have become permanent. Laundries have been established throughout the country, and in many favourable centres nursing homes, both profitable since they are run for the most part without paid labour. But most important of all, cheap educational facilities for girls were offered at a time when little was provided by the English State educational system. This was quickly taken advantage of by non-Romanist parents, whose daughters were soon streaming into convent schools here and in Belgium. The attraction still continues. Many thousands of women have been 'acclimatized' in this way, and a considerable proportion has become definitely attached to Roman Catholicism.

(3) The most important factor of all is found in the fact that since the passing of the Education Act of 1902 Roman Catholicism has become endowed by the State from the pocket of the rate- and tax-payer. It is not generally realized how large is the income which has accrued to the Roman Church through the employment of sisterhoods in the work of elementary education. The teachers receive their salaries, but as they can have no income, the cheques are passed on elsewhere. With the Burnham scale and the development of recognized secondary education, the annual income of the Roman Catholic Church from this source is enormous. And heavier claims are now being made upon public assistance for maintenance of the schools which are so rich a source of income.

(4) A fourth factor which has been generally overlooked is found in the cessation of what was a really violent internecine

quarrel between the Irish Roman Catholics in England and the older Conservative English Romanists over the matter of Home Rule. The setting up of the Free State has given the chance to both parties to work in greater harmony.

The advantages arising in these ways have been telling more and more fully during the last decade. During the whole period the use of the daily press has been brought to a high state of efficiency. Not only has it now become almost impossible for anything to be published likely to tell against the influence or pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church; the press voluntarily gives large prominence in picture and in print to its activities and claims. It was only in the year 1922 that the effort began to co-ordinate press propaganda in every relevant way. The result achieved is far more striking than that of the Press and Publicity Board of the Church Assembly. Further, there is the Romanist press itself. The more popular weekly papers have unpleasant characteristics which are doubtless appreciated by those for whom they are written. But they are valuable aids in the formation and maintenance of *esprit de corps*. The same may be said of the most nearly official organ of the Archbishop of Westminster — the *Tablet*. This paper was once conducted with real distinction and literary talent. It is now under the direction of Mr. Oldmeadow.

Nor do Press activities cease with newspapers and periodicals, or with the publication of pamphlets issued by the Catholic Truth Society. The Westminster Federation, of which its President, Archbishop Bourne, said in 1929 that 'it knew how to act when necessary . . . and how not to do things when there was nothing to do,' has been attempting to set up through its Vigilance Committee a secret censorship over the history books used in the London County Council and other schools. The disgraceful story of this intrigue may be found in Dr. Coulton's *Romanism and Truth*, pt. I, appendix 4, as well as in the account of a protesting member of the Federation (Poynter, 'Inside the Roman Church').

During this period again there has been a considerable invasion of the older Universities. Oxford in this way has become a very different place from Oxford of thirty years ago. This however in the long run may prove to have been a mistaken policy,

as Manning urged. All that it really means is a concentration in Oxford from diffusion elsewhere; but the immediate effect is to give the impression of considerable growth in the Roman Catholic community, with consequent effect upon public opinion.

In the more general attack in the country at large the 'Ne Temere' decree, published in England in 1907, is being used with ever-increasing effect in control of mixed marriages — not only as an engine to compel submission of the non-Romanist party before marriage, but also to disturb the relationship of parties to a mixed marriage before clergy of the Church of England. The situation which lately necessitated the passing of an Act of Parliament in New Zealand, making it an offence to allege that any persons lawfully married are not truly and sufficiently married and that their children are illegitimate, is as real in England as in New Zealand, despite the skilful overthrow of the Bishop of Liverpool by Archbishop Downey in public controversy in 1931. Roman Canon Law is now secretly overriding English law, to the great misery of many persons; while in the work of discovery of mixed marriages Roman Catholic medical men, who are coming over in no inconsiderable numbers from Ireland, play their part, as they do also in reporting cases of the lapsed.

At this point we may pause for a moment to consider the real significance of the period as we now find it. Organization and property and influence have undoubtedly increased. Is the Roman Church however relatively stronger than it was a decade ago? Though about 11,000 converts are registered every year, it is very doubtful whether there is any absolute increase of numbers through conversion. The general public hears little about the lapsed. But the problem of the lapsed in England is the greatest problem that Roman Catholicism has to face. The most conservative recent estimate puts the number at 300,000. The converts themselves do not all remain such for life, and it is said that some difficulty is experienced in keeping up-to-date the somewhat pretentious Catholic *Who's Who*. It is not improbable that there are half a million persons in this country who were once Romanists and are so no longer. And while skilfully organized press propaganda does have undoubted effect, it is no necessary criterion of growth or of real strength. Of those who

are chosen to present the Roman case in public there are only few of real ability. These are skilfully syndicated and boomed; but remove half-a-dozen names, and what is left? The chief speaker set up to refute Dr. Coulton in what is now becoming the centre of gravity of Romanism in England was a convert from a non-graduate Anglican theological college, who distinguished himself on another public occasion by calling the Church of his baptism and early ministry not so much 'a sect as an insect.'

If we may compare the situation in the Roman community with our own, certain conclusions are not improbably true. In the last fifteen years we in the English Church have increased in organization and in public influence. It is doubtful whether we are one whit the stronger thereby or concurrently. Many of us are convinced that we are not. Again, the use of high-sounding names means little, though it deceives the public. When we read of such a thing as a Catholic Council of International Relations we need not be too impressed. Westminster, like Boston, likes this sort of fulsome title, and it is closely followed, with as scanty justification, in at least one Anglican diocese. Nor are we without material for judging the kind of situation which may be completely camouflaged by persistent press manipulation.

However, it cannot be disputed that Roman Catholicism does stand for more in the public eye than it ever did before in England. It fascinates, and continues to make converts, if not of the very distinguished, at least in the peerage and among persons of a certain literary standing. In politics it tells more than ever, and the skilful alliance with Labour, in defiance of the Salford Federation, has compensated Westminster for the loss of the Irish Party in the Commons. The last Education Bill was smothered in a few hours. Moreover, the situation must not be envisaged merely from the point of view of England at home. In 1874 Gladstone expressed his fear (in the pamphlet on 'the Vatican Decrees') lest political trouble should arise from the allegiance of Roman Catholics to a foreign bishop. Though at the time Lord Acton denied that such a danger existed, and though hitherto as far as home and world politics are concerned the Roman Catholic Church in England has been intensely loyal —even to the point of excelling the Archbishop of Canterbury

in horror of the threat to the nation by the strike of 1926 (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω)—yet the situation differs from that obtaining when Lord Acton wrote. The further development of ultramontanism, the use of the idea of papal infallibility in ways which would not be allowed by exact Romanist theologians, the setting up of the new Vatican state, the flag of which now flies regularly over all its ecclesiastical outposts among us, and the sense of power which has reached a pitch almost of ὕβρις in some quarters—all these are things which may lead to a new world orientation of English Romanism. The interests of the Vatican are anti-English, since England still represents a world-power of Protestantism. Certain sections of English Roman Catholics must have felt very uneasy at the strongly-expressed papal disapproval of the English protectorate of Palestine. The humiliation of Lord Strickland with all that preceded it in Malta must have raised many questions as to what might sometime happen elsewhere. The times are now so changed that since the War the English Government has found it necessary to be represented at the Vatican; and the Foreign Office itself is reputed to be attached predominantly to the religion of Rome.

If numbers relative to the total population in Great Britain remain fairly stationary, it is possible that no danger may arise of Roman Catholics having to choose between the command of Rome and the demand of the State. But the point might be arrived at at which the English Government would be forced to treat with the Vatican in regard to its Sovereignty. Nor is the danger so slight as some may imagine. The flooding of England and Scotland with surplus Irish stock continues at an alarming rate, and as is well known, lower racial stocks drive out the better stocks. The Roman Catholic authorities are now envisaging the settlement of these Irish on small holdings up and down the country, and Land Associations are being formed for that purpose. The Archbishop of Liverpool has lately urged that England could provide for twenty or thirty million more persons settled on small holdings. The purchase of estates coming latterly so freely into the market is offering every chance of widespread experiments, and for even greater invasions of impoverished Irish. Presently or ultimately they will be a further financial burden on the British Government and potential dic-

tators of its future policies. The fact that a Roman Catholic quasi-republic with but slender remaining affiliation has been set up at our doors does not make for confidence in a not far distant political outlook when its surplus population shall have overspread the constituencies.

III.

In view of all these things, what ought to be the attitude of the Church of England?

The answer to this question must depend upon what we conceive to be the character and call of Anglicanism. Is the Church of England but a separated fraction of Latin Christianity waiting for time and opportunity to heal the breach with Rome? This is clearly the point of view held by a forceful even if numerically inconsiderable group of its present membership. Or is it what it has declared of itself through its now world-wide episcopate, something *sui generis*, intent on achieving a contribution to world-wide Christianity which will avoid and ultimately resolve the tyranny which the Roman type of Catholicism has developed and perpetuates?

If the former contention is to hold, it is obvious that policy must merely wait upon opportunity, and that aggression from without must be accepted after the fashion of a besieged city which knows that in the long run it will have to make terms, but in the meantime trusts in the strength of its ancients walls. But if the second contention holds, the sooner a definite policy of counter-attack is adopted the better.

The situation really depends upon whether the Church of England determines to remain in isolation or to make common cause with vast forces in Christendom, many of which sprang originally from its stock, or were up to a century ago accounted friends. There can be no middle position, as the unhappy modern term Bridge-Church has suggested, as also Via Media suggested to an earlier day. The only difference between these terms is that the latter defined an accepted position in terms of separation, while the former endeavours to define an uncomfortable position in terms of union. But wherein lies the advantage of being a bridge if its use is not desired by the party on one side and its destruction is being perpetually endeavoured by that on the

other? As to the 'virtuous mean' of Aristotle, that is hard enough to discover in the field of ethics. The track is impossible to align in ecclesiastical affairs.

The secession of Newman and his associates made it abundantly clear that his theoretical *via media* was of no practical value. This fact was recognized by those who were chiefly responsible for resolving the difficulties into which the earlier enthusiasms of the Oxford Movement had plunged the Church. The principle upon which they worked is well described by one to whose statesmanship we owe more than is generally understood. 'It was not the revival of the old Via Media . . . it was not the proposal of a new theory of the Church, its functions, authority and teaching, a counter-ideal to Mr. Ward's imposing Ideal. It was the resolute and serious appeal from brilliant logic and keen sarcasm to reality and experience as well as to history, as to the positive and substantial characteristics of the traditional and actually existing English Church, shown not on paper but in work.'

'An appeal to reality and experience.' That should still be our guiding principle. Since the publication of Dean Church's *History of the Oxford Movement* those positive and substantial characteristics have become more and more clear. The English Church in 1933 presents features of expansion and development undreamed of in 1833. It has been responsible for the world-wide spread of a type of Christianity which sees in a confederacy of national churches a true expression of the catholic order which was common to Christendom before the growth of the hegemony of Rome. As Dr. Dearmer has put it in a recent pamphlet (*The New Reformation*): 'From it and from the creative vigour and self-sacrifice of the Free Churches the spirit has gone forth which is now drawing Christians together of all races and tongues in that new way of unfettered fellowship and free co-operation by which alone, when every nation brings its special gifts, can the regeneration of the world be accomplished.'

The time has come when Church-people at large should make themselves familiar with the facts of the situation. Multitudes do not realize what has occurred in the last century of growth. They are leaving it to their grand-children to discover. Not a few deliberately shut their eyes to it. Not only have twenty

new sees arisen in England; elsewhere through the world there are more than two hundred in communion with the see of Canterbury. When Keble preached his Assize Sermon New South Wales was an archdeaconry within the see of Calcutta!

At the Lambeth Conference of 1930 the position of the Anglican Communion was set out by as many bishops as were present at Nicea. Resolution 49 states that 'the Anglican Communion is a Fellowship, within the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common:

(*a*) they uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorized in their several churches;

(*b*) they are particular or national Churches, and, as such, promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship; and

(*c*) they are bound together not by central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the Bishops in conference.'

Reality and experience has made clear what is the call of the Church of England, and it is a call in relation to Roman Catholicism in that the Divine Will has clearly offered a way to the manifestation throughout the world of a Christianity which does not seek to subjugate in imitation of Imperial Rome. To those who take the world-view it is now no longer any question of possible reconciliation of two ancient provinces of the Church to the ancient western Patriarch. The issue has gone beyond any such point, never to return. The ultimate question is when and under what circumstances will Rome come to reconcile itself to Evangelium in place of Imperium. This will largely depend upon two things—first the ability of Anglican Christianity to achieve true fellowship in the Gospel with all those bodies of Christians who equally reject the Roman claims, and the growing friendliness of whom has been one of the outstanding features of the last fifteen years; and secondly the willingness of Anglican Christianity to continue to foster a liberal theo-

logical outlook. Mr. Shane Leslie has said lately of the English Church that 'her future may lie with Modernism, and certainly the future of Modernism lies with her.' If Modernism should die the only force powerful enough to destroy the bases of Roman pretension will be lost; if it lives it must inevitably in the long run reduce the deliberate obscurantism fostered by the Curial System.

In the adoption of a policy of counter-attack the development of the position and of the principles embraced by the last Lambeth Conference is the operation of chief importance. This will naturally lead to the consolidation of positions turning the flanks and endangering the rear of the present Roman attack. Modernism is already doing its work by driving mines beneath the position of the attacking forces. Mere attempts to beat off attacks however strenuous are in themselves of small avail. A wider strategy must be undertaken. Nevertheless, within the wider strategical action the beating off of attack and even counter-attack must not be neglected. At present too little is done by the Church of England to protect itself and its followers. The various organizations, for the most part directed by deserters, having for their purpose the sapping of the Church's position, are for the most part allowed to work unheeded or in silent contempt. Falsehood, subtle or otherwise, is left to private protagonists like Dr. Coulton to deal with, and little thanks are offered him for the magnificent work which he has achieved single-handed. The Chestertons and the Bellocs and even less weighty champions are allowed to play Goliath unchecked as far as the Church officially is concerned. Where no answer to their taunts is given the rank and file come to think that no answer can be given. Yet the Church is not without Davids who are capable of using their slings. The attempts which are being made so strenuously to create disaffection for the Church, attempts masked by frequent appeals to generosity and toleration, are not attended to. They ought to be attended to, and no specious hope for reunion with Rome should be allowed to interfere with the duty of protecting the imperfectly informed. Anglicans generally should be familiarized with the nature of the attack and with the use of weapons of defence, and among others more particularly the clergy.

But beyond this there ought to be those among us who have the duty of watching and recording the political developments of Papal policy abroad. The situation is very far from being negligible, though dust is thrown in English eyes from Roman Catholic quarters if the normal insular outlook shows any tendency to be extended to the point of interrogating events with which the Roman Church is concerned abroad and in the colonies. The Church of England does not lack intelligence, but it lacks intelligence officers.

It is far from improbable that not a few of us here have had the privilege and pleasure of acquaintance with members of the older Roman Catholic families, either at the Universities or in the Services or in the ordinary affairs of social life. Regard for them naturally entails respect for their religious convictions. But that regard need not blind us to the fact that they are but isolated units in an organization largely composed of very different elements, with no such social or political tradition. It is not the Actons or the Stricklands or those of their class and standing who use or approve of the methods officially or unofficially encouraged by the Roman Catholic authorities in England or abroad. It is with the other elements that our trouble originates, and it is the more embarrassing since we cannot deal with it without seeming to deal obliquely with those with whom we have no quarrel. Nevertheless our duty should be clear; as individuals and as a Church we should take with proper seriousness the offensive which is being so thoroughly developed, and in which every method short of open persecution is being used to maintain and increase advantages gained while we have been indulging in insubordination or in sleep.

THE CHARACTER AND CALL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN RELATION TO THE FREE CHURCHES

By the Rev. Canon Guy Rogers, M.C., B.D., Rector of Birmingham.

PERHAPS I may be allowed to open this discussion of what our relations should be with the Free Churches in a 'modern' world by reminding you of the historic attitude of the Church of England to non-episcopal Churches. The effect of the Oxford Movement has been to obscure in the minds of many the proper balance of our formularies and to write a kind of palimpset over the original documents. This in itself need not be a wicked thing to do, for there is no reason that a living Church should not alter its historic attitude to other Churches even by such methods, and as a matter of fact we live in the hope that all the Churches may yet in some way or other have the courage to change their relations with one another. But it is well to know where we stand historically, for it is obvious that, in a Church like ours in which tradition counts for so much, those who can claim that the modern developments which they are urging are in line with the past and may therefore be regarded as a healthy growth and not abnormal excrescences start with an initial advantage. It will not do to take the line as we are sometimes tempted to do out of sheer weariness, caused by contradicting very self-confident people, that others may have the past so long as we may have the future. We should presently find that the stranglehold of a fictitious past had left us with an wholly illusory future. We should have driven in this way a very bad bargain.

Let me begin then by quoting Archbishop Whitgift's historic words, endorsed later by Archbishop Parker, which may be taken as summing up the spirit in which the Church of England looked at non-episcopal Churches in the early days of the Reformation :

> 'I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ, which no doubt should have been done, if it had been a matter necessary unto the salvation of the Church . . . So that, notwithstanding, government or some kind of government, may be a part of the Church, touch-

ing the outward form and perfection of it, yet is it not such a part of the essence and being, but that it may be the Church of Christ without this or that kind of government; and, therefore, the "kind of government" of the Church is not "necessary unto Salvation."

'I "condemn" no "churches" that have appointed any order for the electing of their pastors which they think agreeable to their state, and most profitable for them; for therefore I say that no certain manner or form of electing ministers is prescribed in the Scripture, because every Church may do therein as it shall seem to be most expedient for the same. That may be profitable for "the Churches of Geneva and France, etc.," which would be most hurtful to this Church of England.'*

It is this position which refuses to unchurch non-episcopal ministries that is firmly established in our Formularies. Article XIX, defining the Visible Church, makes no claim that would exclude Presbyterian or Congregationalist. It is described as 'a Congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.' Nothing could be more cautious and no finer foundation for constructing a truly catholic view in the light of modern knowledge and experience could have been provided. I can remember how as a young man when I passed through the stage of idealizing and exalting the Church, especially that branch of it to which I belonged, what a stumbling block I found this Article. It gave no encouragement to the partizan, it dismissed exclusiveness as something alien to the Church of England, it left no room for boasting. Later on like many others I came to admire its clarity, its magnificent achievement in leaving unsaid the things that ought not to be said, its preservation of the open way. The same resolve to maintain the open way is set forth with equal care in Article 23, which deals with Ministering in the Congregation. How cool and collected is the answer of the Church of England to the fervour of Neo-Catholicism. If you want to know who are lawful ministers of Christ's Church our advice to you is that we ought to judge as lawfully called and sent 'those which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's Vineyard.' How very differently might these Articles have run if some well-meaning people of the Oxford Movement had been

* Quoted from J. W. Hunkin's *Episcopal Ordination*, p. 13.

entrusted with drawing them up. We might have found ourselves committed to the position that visibility of the visible Church depends upon the visibility of the bishop, and that for a minister to be lawfully sent he must be in the straightest line of the Apostolic Succession as most straightly interpreted by the straightest of straight Churchmen. From either of these spiritual misfortunes we have been delivered not simply by the characteristic caution of the English Reformers, but we believe also by the guidance of the Holy Spirit who has some 'better thing' in store for all of us than the isolations and divisions of the past.

But even more important than the Articles themselves is the spirit of reasonableness which breathes through the Preface on Ceremonies which introduces our Prayer Book, and it is the very opposite of that rigid spirit, which in the name of a Catholicism inherited from the past, so often impedes the growing Catholicism of the future. Speaking of the different ceremonies, some to be retained, some to be taken away, our Prayer Book makes no claim that it is providing a standard for others or finality for itself. Let me recall the words:

> 'For as those be taken away which were most abused, and did burden men's consciences without any cause; so the other that remain, are retained for a discipline and order, which (upon just causes) may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with God's Law . . . And in these our doings we condemn no other Nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only. For we think it convenient that every country should use such Ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition.'

It is important that this general framework of our Prayer Book and formularies should be recalled in view of the rigid deductions which are sometimes made from one particular part of it. The Preface to the Ordinal is a case in point, which runs as follows:

> 'It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons . . . And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.'

This Preface is interpreted by some to mean not merely that the Church of England is committed to Episcopacy as a mode of government, but that it cannot even conceive of any other form of government. But in the light of the general framework of the Prayer Book, whether it is to be described as British caution or Christian liberalism, it is not possible to maintain this view. It would be a grievous hindrance in any case if it were necessary to accept it, and would involve the Church in constant agitation until the incriminating words which justified it were expunged from our formularies. For the result of historical research into the origins of episcopacy has made it clear that none of the competing systems of Church Government can substantiate an exclusive claim, a divine monopoly, from the New Testament. There is something to be said for all of them, for some more, for some less. In the charitable words of Canon Streeter it may be said that 'all have won and all shall have prizes,' or in the severer but perhaps more accurate words of another writer, 'All have lost and none shall have prizes.' In any case it means the same thing. The exclusive claim is a lost cause in the modern world. It will never again as in mediaeval times command general assent. I am afraid that some of my friends in the Oxford Movement must eventually take their places with Thomas Cartwright and William Travers as examples of good men who spoiled their case by overstating it. These two divines insisted that the Presbyterian form of Church government was the only one sanctioned by Scripture, and the case for which they stood is set out at length in the Book of Discipline published in 1580. History has been unkind both to them and to the book, and each restatement of an exclusive claim whether Roman or Anglican or Presbyterian, however sincerely made or for the time being dialectically impressive, breaks eventually against a certain Christian temper which Christianity generates as an antiseptic to its own theology. Long before the logical refutation of the argument has been found devout souls in all the Churches concerned have inwardly joined in rejecting it.

* * * *

I come now to ask how this historic non-committal attitude of the Church of England towards the non-episcopal Churches may be made to serve the larger interests of the Kingdom of

God in our day and generation. Clearly a non-committal attitude is out of date in these days in which the mutual interdependence of Churches is as much a revelation from God as the interdependence of nations. The very word itself, 'non-committal,' if overstressed raises in a new and not less objectionable form the question of exclusiveness. I have suggested, however, that the historic attitude so described may contain within it the germ of Christian liberalism, and it is plainly our duty to develop it accordingly. Probably no greater contribution to the building of united Church life in the future could be made than the public acknowledgment that none of the Churches in their present forms or structure are *essential* to the catholicity of the future, but that each of them may have some contribution to make without which the resulting synthesis would be the poorer. The classical words of the Preface in the Prayer Book, 'In these our doings we condemn no other nation,' must be converted under the fuller guidance of the Holy Spirit into something positive, so that they run, 'In these our doings we welcome the contributions of other Churches.'

It is characteristic of a living Church that it should manifest just such powers of development and adaptation as are implied in the change that I have suggested. The weakness of the old Evangelical position was that it appeared so static. While it stolidly upheld the Reformation, it did not busy itself with interpreting the principles of the Reformation in terms of modern life. Meantime the Oxford Movement gave all the appearance of life and proceeded to interpret certain Catholic features of the Prayer Book—with little consideration for its general framework or governing principles—in such a way that the original direction of the Church of England threatened in the course of time to be entirely altered. There certainly never has been anything static about the Anglo-Catholic movement, and it can never be tempered with discipline and sound judgment until it finds itself engaged in creative strife within the Church of England with a movement that is prepared fearlessly to vindicate in terms of modern life the essential kinship of the Church of England with the non-episcopal Churches of the Reformation.

The call to do so has come in a very remarkable way in our generation through the Reunion Movement which has quickened

in the minds of Christians throughout the world dreams and aspirations and in their hearts a fervour and enthusiasm of which in the nature of things the sixteenth century could know nothing. The immediate cause of this Reunion Movement is the immense expansion of Christian Missions in the nineteenth century with the resultant embarrassment both to the teaching of the faith and to the building up of institutional life. The scandal of projecting into Asia and Africa all the consequences of the local controversies of a particular epoch in European history began to strike the imagination. The spectacle of rival Christian Churches educating their members to excommunicate one another even in the presence of surrounding heathenism appalled the more thoughtful. The first attempt to mitigate this disastrous state of things was the acceptance of the Comity of Missions which was established, as far as it could be, by the great Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. For this reason it is often claimed, not without justification, that the modern Reunion Movement began with that Conference. The Comity of Missions implied a general agreement on the part of denominational Missionary Societies and the Churches which they represented not to infringe each other's territory and to avoid as far as possible the building up of rival Christian Churches in the same locality. The agreement arrived too late in the day to undo a great deal of the evil. But it was a significant sign of the growing sense of interdependence amongst the Churches; and the implications involved were more far reaching than were at first perceived, except by the Roman Church, which with its usual logical exclusiveness refused to co-operate. For it is evident that if one Church concedes to another territorial rights and freedom to provide without opposition or competition its own ministry and sacraments in a certain area, it is tacitly accepting the validity of such Orders and ministry. What is to happen, for example, when its members migrate into the area conceded to the other? Having by a self-denying ordinance limited its own freedom to take the Gospel and Sacraments into this place where its members are going, is it to forbid them to communicate with the Christian Church within the area and so deprive them for life of the Christian Sacraments? The position is an absurd one if, for example, Christians in the south of Persia where the Chris-

tian Church happens to be Episcopal on moving to the north of Persia where the Church happens to be Presbyterian are shut out for ever from the Holy Communion. It is for this reason that even the Lambeth Conference of 1930, whose spirit and tone was far different to that of 1920 and much less sensitive to the historic toleration of the Church of England for non-episcopal ministries, was compelled to sanction such intercommunion. It does so, I regret to say, very grudgingly. The concession would appear to have given as much pain as if a tooth were being extracted, but still it is conceded against a background of cautionary admonitions. Referring to the general rule that 'Members of the Anglican Churches should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church,' the Resolution continues :

> 'The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who may, in his discretion so exercised, sanction an exception to the general rule in special areas, where the ministrations of an Anglican Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances, or may give permission that baptized communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own should be encouraged to communicate in Anglican churches, when the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special or temporary circumstances.'

The fact is that once a Church gives up its exclusive claims and embarks upon a policy of Christian comity the logic both of reason and circumstance proves too much for it. It finds itself compelled sooner or later to practice intercommunion and eventually to seek union.

It may seem a long way from the acceptance of the Comity of Missions to the South India scheme of Union, but it is the inevitable development of the original consent to regard the Mission field as one area in which the Word is preached and the Sacraments administered in friendly co-operation by various Churches responsible only for their own localities. The abandonment by consent of the exclusive aim to evangelize the whole area made it impossible not to recognize the achievements of other Churches and left the way open, of which a later generation was sure to take advantage, for securing a general fusion of institutional Church life.

This development in India is really of crucial interest to the Church of England, for it involves the historic reassertion in a

modern setting of the Church's refusal to condemn non-episcopal Ministries with the appropriate action attached which the modern Reunion Movement demands. Until this concrete scheme appeared on the horizon, the Reunion Movement in Great Britain, although sensitive to the growing spirit of Unity throughout the world, lacked a standard by which to test itself and the vision of a practical goal which might be achieved. We cannot live indefinitely on the magnificent and moving generalities of the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian people. The vision of which it speaks 'of a Church genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians, within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole body of Christ,' needs at least some partial embodiment in the course of time unless it is to be dismissed by the disillusioned as idle rhetoric. Here is the opportunity of acknowledging within a newly-constituted branch of the Catholic Church these Ministries which the Appeal allows to 'have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of Grace.' An achievement in South India with regard to the fusion (I use the word 'fusion' advisedly as the correct antithesis to 'absorption') of Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Ministries must inaugurate a new epoch in the Reunion Movement at home.

* * * *

What concerns us, however, most intimately at the moment is how to carry into our relations with the Free Churches at home something of that unifying spirit which is so powerfully effecting large parts of the mission field — how to take advantage of the wind of the Spirit that is blowing, to prepare for that larger catholicity which we hope to share one day with our non-episcopal brethren. We are often reminded that we have not reached the stage, as in South India, of constructing a constitution but only of fostering a spirit.

Yet it is precisely here that we need to be on our guard, for there are some people who seem to imagine that fostering a spirit is unrelated to concrete action, whereas we believe that if the Church of England is to be true to itself in this testing time of Reunion it must commit itself to definite acts, and we propose

to see to it, so far as our influence and example is concerned, that it does not fail to commit itself to acts which express our kinship with other Reformed Churches.

Naturally we shall work for the extension of and judicious putting into operation of the liberties accorded by Resolution XII of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 with regard to exchange of pulpits. Already the Church of England is growing accustomed to hearing the Gospel preached in its churches by non-episcopally ordained ministers, so much so that when a few months ago a Nonconformist preached for the first time in Westminster Abbey the event passed with little general comment and with no more than a perfunctory protest from quarters which had been very vociferous in the past.

We shall also be glad to take our part in popularizing Resolution 46 of the Lambeth Conference of 1930. Our disappointment that this particular Conference devoted so little of its time to the cause of Home Reunion and handled it with so little psychological skill, will not prevent us exploring to the full such avenues as have been opened to us. Resolution 46 runs as follows :

> 'Meanwhile the Conference urges the desirability of organizing and participating in efforts of Evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other Communities, both as a means of bearing effective witness to the multitudes who are detached from all forms of organized Christianity, and as a means of expressing and strengthening that sense of unity in the Gospel which binds together in spiritual fellowship those who own allegiance to different Churches.'

It is deeply to be regretted that in quarters where this resolution might most certainly be expected to operate it is for one reason or another apparently dismissed as unworkable. Take for example the Industrial Christian Fellowship which organizes Evangelistic Crusades in so many dioceses in this country. I should like to ask the Fellowship how many Crusades has it organized on an interdenominational basis? In view of the success of the interdenominational Crusade in Birmingham which anticipated the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference and now stands out as the concrete embodiment of what the Resolution urges, I would ask what steps has it taken since 1930 to organize its campaigns on an interdenominational basis? And if it should think fit to shift the responsibility for living up to the spirit of

Resolution 46 to the particular areas concerned, then I would respectfully ask the Bishops concerned what are the insuperable obstacles which prevent Crusades in their dioceses being organized on an interdenominational basis in order that in accordance with Resolution 46 the Church may bear 'effective witness to the multitudes who are detached from all forms of organized Christianity'? I can assure them, as one who had some responsibility for organizing such a Crusade in Birmingham, that nothing so effectually opened the door of opportunity to us, so impressed the city, organized Labour, and the local Press, as the fact that this was a united effort on the part of the Christian Churches.

But there is another concrete act of greater importance and deeper spiritual implication which is now challenging those of us who believe that episcopal and non-episcopal ministries are destined to coalesce in a larger catholicity. The interchange of pulpits and the organization of Evangelistic and social work on an interdenominational basis will continue steadily to infiltrate through the Church of England. The real spiritual approach to one another of an institutional kind must be through the Sacrament of Holy Communion. It is at this point that the Modern Churchman has his greatest contribution to make to the cause of Reunion and his greatest task in converting his fellow-Churchmen to the freedom of his own approach.

A whole knot of complexes restricts the free approach to the subject of intercommunion from which only those who have been baptized afresh into the Spirit of Jesus (and that I take is what we mean by the modern spirit) can hope to escape. The privileged position of the priest, the power sense of the hereditary caste, the indefinable superiority of those who deem themselves within the Covenant to those whom they regard as without, all combine to make admission to the altar and the right to administer at it the most jealously guarded of ecclesiastical privileges. It is true that, except where a Church depends for its very life on the claim to be exclusive, the whole trend of modern thought, as of historic investigation, is to expose and discredit the assumptions round which these complexes gather. But they disappear slowly and their gradually withdrawing presence may still be discerned in official pronouncements and in the process of rationalization by which it is sought to forbid or to delay inter-

communion. When we have actually reached the point, at which the official conference between Bishops of our own Church and representative Free Churchmen arrived after Lambeth 1920, of admitting that Free Church Ministries are 'real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church,' it might be expected that acts of intercommunion would be officially sanctioned, but the knot of complexes intervenes and technicalities of Order are invoked to delay the inevitable deductions.

Or again, when growing intimacy in work and evangelization has drawn Anglicans and Free Churchmen so close that the desire grows strong to give sacramental expression to their common experience, the fiction is invented that Holy Communion is so perfect and sacred a thing that it must not be used as a means to an end. To allow it to create Unity is somehow or other to treat it with disrespect! It must not be the stepping-stone across which adventurous souls may cross the river which divides them — only the coping-stone of the Church's reunited institutional life. And yet I ask which metaphor, a stepping-stone or a coping-stone, suits the meaning of a sacrament best — which better corresponds with the spirit of life?

It is essential, I think, that, in accordance with this new revelation of interdependence of Churches as of nations, we as Modern Churchmen should take our stand upon the broad principle of reciprocity at the Lord's Table. The accusation that we are indifferent to questions of Order will quite unjustly be brought against us, but that is a small matter so long as eventually we secure that the subject of sacramental fellowship shall not be treated as a sub-section of the vexed question of Orders. It becomes more and more intolerable to the conscience that the continued determination to equate them, which has no justification in the New Testament, should prevent the sacramental consummation of a spiritual fellowship which the Church itself has encouraged and that it should also by its unreasonableness prejudice the whole cause of Reunion.

For it cannot be denied that the cause of Reunion both with the Free Churches in this country and with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland is being seriously injured by the hesitation on the part of the Church of England to sanction specific acts of intercommunion. The recent debate in the General Assembly

of the Church of Scotland on continuing what the English episcopate describes as 'unrestricted conversations' on the subject of Reunion was very significant. By a majority the Assembly voted that only on the basis of complete equality should these conversations be continued. It is well known that it is some reasonable measure of intercommunion which is thus implied.

In the same way the present Lambeth negotiations with the Free Churches are being held up. Non-episcopal ministries are asking for some visible, I might truly say, a sacramental sign that under all the fine words that are addressed to them there does not still lurk the old Roman doctrine, No Bishop, no Priest; no Priest, no Sacrament. The declarations that at times seem so truly Christian, and are subsequently discovered to be both ambiguous and inoperative, have produced doubts of the bona-fide character of the intentions of the Church of England. What the non-episcopal ministries need to be assured of is not that the Church of England proposes to abandon either episcopacy for itself or its belief in constitutional episcopacy as the best form of government for a widespread and far-flung Church, but that it does not make any exclusive claim for it as essential to a valid sacrament. Until that answer is forthcoming in specific acts of intercommunion, disabling doubt will hamper the negotiations and, if unresolved, will finally destroy them.

To the argument so often urged that intercommunion would delay the cause of federated or organic unity (the sharp distinctions between the two are breaking down), it is only necessary to point out that it is those who are seeking such unity with us who have come to feel it is essential if they are to make further progress. They are entitled to remind us that the success of internal Methodist and Presbyterian reunion largely depended on the background of intercommunion which already existed. We are assured by competent people that such reunion would never have taken place without the creation of such a psychological attitude to one another as the practice of intercommunion brings with it. Is it any wonder that they argue from the lesser to the greater problem and see its only possible solution in the creation of a new psychology through sacramental fellowship between episcopal and non-episcopal Churches.

* * * *

Our particular responsibility may be briefly summed up as an endeavour to secure that the whole reunion movement with the Free Churches shall be approached in the full light of modern knowledge, and in full dependence upon the creative spirit of God. The categories of the past can never be regarded as sufficiently ample for the experience of the present. The Catholic Church when it emerges will not be simply an imitation of some vision borrowed from the past, but rather an approximation to a vision seen upon a far horizon. Our descendants when they read the story of our prolonged struggles about niceties of order and validity will sympathize with us — I hope they will not despise us — for having lived in the last days of the machine age of the Church.

We can only do our best to see that by clear teaching and courageous practice the knot of complexes which create obsessions in the minds of many sincere Churchmen are gradually dissolved. Such opportunity for achieving deliverance seems to me pre-eminently provided by the practice of intercommunion.

These are days in which personal witness is given its full value — sometimes even more than its value. For whatever it is worth I should like to conclude by witnessing to the fact that my own resolve to share in the Holy Communion with the communicant members of other Christian Churches, should occasion arise, and to welcome them similarly to my own Church has given me a delightful sense of freedom from old complexes which once troubled me, a spiritual experience both of Christ and of Christian fellowship in Him, with which I would not part, and a quickened resolve to break through the remaining barriers which still separate us from our Free Church brethren.

THE CHARACTER AND CALL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN RELATION TO MODERNISM

By Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

THERE has grown up among us, and is now come by many to be taken for granted, what is called the Branch Theory of the Church: the theory that the Universal Church of Christ, in its primitive times undivided and uniform, now exists in three main branches—the Roman, the Greek-Orthodox and the Anglican, which alone have preserved intact throughout the ages the four elements of Catholic Communion: the tradition of the Faith embodied in the Creeds and Dogmatic Definitions of the Church, the System of Sacraments, the Apostolic Succession of Bishops, and acceptance of the Bible as interpreted by the Church. This theory I believe to be misleading history; and, because it is not true, one from the acceptance of which no good can come. With regard to the earlier Christian centuries, it takes no account of the great variety which existed both in doctrine and in practice; with regard to the later, it obscures the principle of development which it would be more like the reality we know to find also in religion. There has been evolution in religion; in the Christian religion too. Indeed, we Modernists believe that the character and call of the Church of England are expressed in the fact that she marks the main line of that development.

Soon after the 'establishment' of Christianity by Constantine, the Greek Orthodox Church diverged from the main line of Christian progress and followed a side-track into superstition and decay. Reform became impossible, and the result, after many centuries, has been the Russian revolt from all religion to-day. On the other hand, the 'establishment' placed the Church in Italy and the North in close touch with the main currents of human life, so that western Christianity and civilization flowed on together. Within the great organization of the Papacy the Church of England was, by its own choice, as firmly welded as that of any other European people.

This is not to say that it was completely merged. It was the policy of Rome at first to allow considerable freedom in liturgy, language and tradition. Pope Gregory the Great, for example, when consulted by Augustine of Canterbury as to the services most likely to be useful for the English, replied, 'If you have found anything either in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to God, carefully make choice of the same and sedulously teach the English.' Accordingly, in the oldest Anglo-Saxon missals we find a Roman liturgy abounding in Gallican details.[1] Again, to take another aspect, from the time when William the Conqueror made reply to Gregory the Seventh, 'My predecessors, the Kings of the English, never did homage to the Pope, and therefore neither will I,' there were created a number of precedents for the final refusal of King Henry the Eighth to acknowledge the growing papal absolutism in the sphere of civic life. But, paradoxical though it may sound, the conditions which actually made the break with Rome possible were bestowed by the Papacy itself and were largely the result of the general loyalty given to its authority by the English people; for the Roman system, by its unifying strength and by the relative peace which it maintained, indirectly fostered the racial spirit of the English and helped it to mature into a national consciousness. Since the Papacy, however, was at the same time extending its claims and increasingly expressing a spirit quite alien to the English genius, it was inevitable that the latter must, in the course of time, either be given its freedom or else take it. Here is to be seen one of the deep and true causes of the English Reformation.

It is a notable fact that all the chief characteristics which marked the Church of England at the Reformation are also the chief notes of Modernism to-day. The first of these notes is Freedom, that liberty of spirit which belongs to the essence of religion and without which men cannot attain to their full development. And allied with this, is Truth. With a rooted and sound instinct for tradition, the Church of England has never-

[1] What Mons. Duchesne describes as the ultramontane tendency in liturgies was inaugurated in the eighth century only, by St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, and spread somewhat slowly and with but little fostering by the Popes.

theless always valued sound learning and has followed the Truth, so far as she could grasp it, whithersoever it led. It was because she was drawn to European culture, because, in other words, she had an instinct for man's total perfection and wished to add to the voice of religion the other voices of human experience (an essentially Modernist attitude), that from the year 664 (the date of the Council of Whitby) she was voluntarily a member of the Roman system — the then universal western system, which produced in the thirteenth century the greatest age of Christian speculation : an age of faith, or rather poetry, which was also an age of real belief in Reason. This system, however, developed a theology which, while logically perfect, was not grounded sufficiently on fact : at its heart was abstraction, its premises were accepted on external authority, and supernaturalism was inherent in it. God and the world were in the last resort regarded by it as two opposites, the Divine Revelation to man as external and miraculously guaranteed.

Then, in the fourteenth century, came a new outbreak of the human spirit, partly an intellectual awakening (through the study of the classics) to a sense of human history, and partly a reaction from the former ecclesiastical and ascetic mood to the Hellenic joy in art and nature. Man's totality, we may say, was again asserting itself. After the first magnificent, un-selfconscious ardour, in which humanistic studies were promoted by ecclesiastics, pre-eminently, for instance, by Popes Nicholas the Fifth and Pius the Second — thus sowing within the mediaeval system itself seeds of the coming Reformation—this new belief in human reason and this joy in human life were seen to be at variance with religious dogma and with moral discipline. They were given free rein nevertheless, and a practical dualism arose, through which were witnessed the crudest immoralities and the most deadening scepticism in the central seat of Christendom. But then the humanist movement crossed the Alps. It underwent a change, losing some of its colour, its joyousness and aesthetic ardour, but also some of its paganism, as it came into contact with races more constitutionally ethical. In England no religious scepticism was engendered, no thought of overturning the Roman system contemplated ; demands arose only to purify and reform it. The humanism of such men as Colet, More and Eras-

mus, who had most influence here, took them to the Scriptures, and the result was a quickening of the spiritual consciousness. Although there was no grappling with the problem of the ultimate authority in religion, the centre of gravity of faith steadily shifted : its proportions altered. Colet, for example, said that the Pope should receive as much attention as was given him by St. Paul. This makes it strange that he did not go on to attack the Papacy in principle. What a hairsbreadth separated this point of view, so widely held, from that of advocating a Catholicism without the Pope !

Political and personal events cut the slender thread. Separation, when it did come, was occasioned actually by the King's desire for a divorce, of the kind granted daily to others by the Pope, and by the Pope's denial in this instance. But the moment that the formal separation was effected, events proved that the incorporation of the Church of England in the Papal system had for some time become a matter of external organization rather than a true spiritual tie. The Scriptures had superseded the Papacy.

Thus did the Spirit of Freedom and of Truth together carry the Church of England into a new line of development. Freedom is the condition of all growth, even of the growth of Truth. Yet again it is Truth that dissolves the power of ancient bonds and enables men to set themselves free. There followed in England a great revival of religion. As the late Professor A. V. G. Allen says, 'The most characteristic feature of the English people . . . in the sixteenth century is the prevailing sense of the presence of God . . . The State took on a divine character, the king's will was regarded as divine because it was in harmony with the people's will, and the will of the people was reflecting the will of God.' This conviction that God was leading and protecting the nation grew deeper and more widespread, culminating with the victory over the Armada. The belief that God leads men in their every avocation bore fruit in all the activities of the nation's life, in the new blossoming of literature, in architecture (which reflected the movement of religion from the Church to the home), in exploration and in naval enterprise. England advanced to leadership among the nations because the totality of man's life was felt to be blessed by God.

Now was the Roman Church, like the Greek before it, left aside from the mainstream of religious development. At the Council of Trent (1545-63) it proceeded definitely to fix its doctrines, including (a point which seems to have escaped notice) the first corporate affirmation of the supremacy of the Pope, although the Popes themselves had so long claimed predominance. Great scholars continue to be numbered in the Roman Church, it is true, but they must always bring their learning into line with the Tridentine teachings. Similarly, the Roman Catholic Church cherishes saints; but the eyes of saints are cleared to behold truth even in superstitions, and when they address their efforts to reform they must confine them to the sphere of conduct. Of the three chief countries which after the Reformation remained under Roman sway, we observe that France in the eighteenth century and Spain to-day have experienced revolutions hostile to religion, the time for reformation being long overpast. And who knows what may in time happen in Italy, although Papacy and Fascism, resembling each other in method and in outlook, attempt at present to go hand in hand?

Leaving surmise aside, in Papal Europe the sixteenth century was swept by the Counter-Reformation. Under Venice alone, strong enough to resist the Papacy, did investigation and philosophy flourish. Giordano Bruno, and later Galileo, knew their best days at Padua under Venetian sway. But in England William Harvey (1578—1657), himself a former student of physiology at Padua, published his conclusions on the circulation of the blood unmolested by the Church, although they overthrew accepted theories of man's constitution. Even Hobbes (1588—1679), though not beloved of clergymen, was, as Mr. Hardwick has said, what in these days we might call a Liberal Protestant; while Sir Isaac Newton (1642—1727) was all his life a profoundly religious man, who wrote books and tracts upon the Bible and was frequently solicited to take Holy Orders by the most eminent divines. In the atmosphere, then, which cherished Harvey, Hobbes, Newton and other innovators, in an atmosphere of reverence for sound learning, the English Reformation developed; and in that atmosphere—speaking by faith—shall it in our day also continue the great work which was then set in hand.

The briefest word must suffice for the second period of King Henry's reign. We have already shown how the proportions of the Christian faith were changed for learned Englishmen. But we must take definite note of the Ten Articles, promulgated officially by the Church in 1536, in the first flush of the separation from Rome. Although these were overridden later by the forces of reaction, so that the Reformation can hardly be said to have effectively commenced until King Edward VI's reign, it is important to note the distinction which they make between 'things necessary and things indifferent.' The former are the Bible and the Creeds as the grounds of faith, the Sacraments of the Altar, of Baptism and of Penance, and the Doctrine of Justification. Among the latter are the honouring of, and prayers to, the Saints, the use of images, rites and ceremonies, and the Doctrine of Purgatory. This does not take us far, it is true, but the distinction itself between things essential and non-essential is a far-reaching one, one in harmony with the mind of the Lord Who distinguished between commandments greater and less, and one to which Modernists are faithful. What floodgates it opens!

This change in the proportions of the English faith was reflected presently in the Prayer Book, which includes within it the Thirty-nine Articles and the Ordinal. We all know that the Prayer Book is not the production of a single age; that between 1549 and 1662, when it received its final official shape, it passed through five stages of alteration and revision. Thus it is not stamped with the hall-mark of any revolutionary; not dominated, for example, as is Lutheranism, by the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, or as is Calvinism by the Doctrine of Predestination. The Church of England shrank from formal definition, rejected purely logical theories, stood for the manifestation of the divine life in man rather than for a body of dogmas. The work of Cranmer and his associates and followers appears in the end, after some excesses in the intermediate stages, as the work of those in whom reason and conscience operated together (in what has been called the exercise of sanctified common-sense) on a vast array of doctrinal and liturgical material, both old and new, and on an accumulation of new influences and learning. It was bold in its freedom, strong in its truthfulness.

Let us examine the Prayer-Book teaching in regard to the

four crucial subjects of Christian tradition — the Creeds and Dogmatic Definitions, the Sacraments, the Church and the Bible.

'The true doctrine of the Church of England' is stated in the preface to the Thirty-nine Articles to be contained therein. Inasmuch as the Articles set forth some doctrines which form no part of medieval theology, it is to these innovations we must look if we would know the distinctive doctrinal position of the Church of England, the grounds of her claim to leave the Church of Rome behind. That there are medievalisms in the Articles is not to be disputed, but Christianity, as an evolving religion, is not to be expected to have left them all behind at once. There remain vestigial structures, more than one useless 'appendix,' which at times calls for a surgical operation, as it were, in the highest Christianity. But, to change the metaphor, no medievalisms pour in upon us from the Articles. As was pointed out by the American scholar, Dr. Carl Grammar, in a striking essay on the Articles years ago, the real sources of medieval infiltrations are the extravagant views of Church authority and of the magical efficacy of sacraments which the Articles condemn. The Articles are directed primarily against evils which still flourish in the Church of England, and which would flourish more if the Articles, at the present stage, were dropped.

Thus Article XXI, which incidentally preserves the traditional word 'propitiation' in speaking of the Self-oblation of the Lord upon the Cross, is the one which condemns roundly the sacrifice of masses. Need I ask in which of the two expressions the distinctive position of the Church of England is to be discerned? And need I ask whether that position represents a theological advance? Similarly, Article XXVII excludes transubstantiation from the doctrine, and reservation from the practice, of the Church of England; nor is it possible honourably to re-introduce them under the aegis of modern pseudo-metaphysical subtleties altogether lacking the intellectual vigour to combat superstitions which the doctrine of transubstantiation failed to remedy and which the Reformers hated even more than the scholastic intricacies of the doctrine itself. On the positive side, the chief Sacrament of Christianity was set forth primarily as a means of communion with God, and the oblation of the worshipper stressed as a living sacrifice, not

the death of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice. Our Communion Service makes real to us, as no other service can, the spirit of Jesus, the spirit of complete self-sacrifice; and the receiving of the broken bread and wine which He called His Body and Blood becomes the effective symbol of the strengthening of our spirits by His own and of our union with each other in His fellowship.

The doctrine of the Church was, before the Reformation, understood in an exclusively sacerdotal sense, but in Article XIX the visible Church is defined as a congregation of faithful men among whom the word of God is preached, and the sacraments (*i.e.* Baptism and the Holy Communion) are duly administered. Turning to the Communion Service, therefore, we find the Church described there as 'The blessed company of all faithful people.' Similarly, in the Prayer for all Sorts of Men, the Catholic Church is equated with 'all who profess and call themselves Christians.' We must note, too, the statement in the Catechism that Christ has redeemed 'me and all mankind' and the General Thanksgiving for 'the redemption of the world.' Not only is Calvinism here plainly rejected (by which we must interpret the wavering on the subject in Article XVII), but a doctrinal basis is laid for the English view of the Church as the Nation on its spiritual side. By the 'establishment' of the Church in England, the public and domestic life of the nation is permeated with religion; the secular future of humanity is bound up with Christianity; the binding of Church and State together lays the broad foundations for a new civilization in which neither superstition nor secularism is given a place. Thus the laity cease to be called, as they were in medieval times, *carnales*; they are given the Prayer Book, which puts them on an equal footing with the clergy; they are given the Bible to promote in them the sense of possessing, independently of the priest, the whole matter of religion. The priesthood of the laity is a distinctive doctrinal tenet of the Church of England. It is true that, with its sense of value in things old and tried, the Church of England preserved the traditional order of bishops, priests and deacons, but in this wider setting of which we have been speaking the doctrine of apostolic succession, with its attempted canalizing of the Divine Grace, loses its error and

materialism. The original equality of the episcopate is restored by regarding bishops as fathers in God and constitutional governors, not as members of a hierarchical prelacy under a chief bishop or pope who is the visible representative of Christ on earth; and the priesthood is dignified by regarding the bishop as one of its members, a first among equals. Finally, the doctrine of Church infallibility is shattered by the statement in Article XXI that particular churches have erred, and may err. Wherefore there is nothing to tie down the Church absolutely even to the Reformers, though obviously we should be usurpers of our heritage unless the New Reformation which as Modernists we desire to inaugurate — nay, *have* inaugurated — were true to the principles and spirit of our predecessors.

What was the attitude of the English Reformers to the Creeds? First, of course, they reverenced them; but, secondly, they supplemented them, as one has said, 'by the larger faith in the primary importance of the life of Christ.' Thus Article VIII places them in their proper position as directly dependent on the Bible. The General Councils, on whose authority the Creeds depended before this time, may err, we are told, and have erred. In Article II, a statement on the Son of God which closely resembles in its wording that of the Definition of Chalcedon, peculiar point is given by that resemblance to an omission. The significant words deliberately omitted by the reformers are 'the Mother of God.' Thus we are thrown back from the authority of the Councils to the uninterpreted statements of the Bible concerning the Virgin Birth. The Reformers themselves put forward no new view of the Incarnation, but, having freed the doctrine from medieval accretions, they make possible our progress towards its fuller understanding. With the advance in knowledge of the Bible it has come to pass that even strictly orthodox theologians in the Church of England now state unequivocally that the Virgin Birth is not essential to the Incarnation: those who disbelieve it altogether have legitimate grounds within the Bible for so doing.

The reference of the Creeds back to the Bible carries with it, moreover, the fundamental implication that we are given authority to re-interpret them whenever necessary in the light of the Bible more fully understood.

But something more needs to be said as to the Church of England's attitude towards the Bible. The human spirit was, at the Reformation, too unfledged, as it were, to claim full authority for itself. That, no doubt, is the reason — and not real cowardice — why the Reformers at times wavered. Therefore, too, they used the Bible as a refuge: it provided within itself a temporary anchorage. Launched upon unvoyaged seas, thought could in times of peril rest there, where human interpretation nevertheless has a necessary place. It was a providential refuge, for the Bible is hindered by its form from exercising a lasting despotism over the human spirit. It is for the most part a history, whose value lies in the aspirations which it both awakens and expresses, rather than in the scenes which it depicts. This history, too, is beset with difficulties and contradictions, and no rational being can for long acquiesce in the low view of Revelation which suggests that the Spirit of Truth expresses itself in enigmas. Hence, Reason and Conscience, taking refuge in the Bible, found themselves sustained and strengthened there, and at last inspired to braver journeyings. For this the Reformers, in their wisdom, made provision in defining their attitude to Scripture. Perhaps they were wiser than they knew; certainly their faces were set towards the future, where lies the destiny of man. Thus the pivot Article, number VI, never uses of the Bible that dangerous term 'the Word of God': it lays down no theory of inspiration, and under its terms (as is beautifully shown by H. B. Wilson in *Essays and Reviews*) one may interpret the Bible literally or allegorically, or as parable, or poetry, or legend. We note, however, a significant proviso. It is said in Article XX that no one part of the Bible is to be expounded so that it be repugnant to another — and this leads straight on to modern studies upon it, and so to an evolutionary view of its contents. For the rest, the Bible is said simply to 'contain' all the truths necessary to make man wise unto salvation.

Enough has been said to prove that the Church of England has a doctrinal position of her own, and one in which lie the seeds of progress on the lines followed by her loyal Modernist members. There is no room for doubt as to her essentially Modernist mind.

Throughout the changes of the Reformation, the inner

strength of the Church of England lay in the deep life which flowed in her from the Spirit. The adaptations which she made, and the casting off of her dead leaves, are but the signs of life. She was not exhausted by the Reformation, but was carried on with similar strength through the succeeding generations. Time fails me to demonstrate how, in the seventeenth century, her spirit was expressed, not in the Laudian school, which harked back to Church authority, nor by the Puritans, who rested faith on the inner light in each individual breast, but in the schools of Lord Falkland and the Cambridge Platonists, who combined both of these authorities with Reason. These stayed inside the Church, while from the others went forth shoots of Nonconformity. Nor, again, must I stay to show how, in the eighteenth century, the Church of England, admitting scientific studies, accepted a mechanistic view of the universe and the authority of Common Reason, but yet was saved from Unitarianism or rationalism in the persons of its greatest divines, like Butler, by the constant recognition of man's ignorance; and presently allowed the evangelical recognition of the authority of religious emotion, although when given full range this led the Methodists to separation.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Church of England had not yet been compelled to face the fundamental problems of the true character of Revelation and the nature of religious authority. The logical faculty, the moral faculty and the inner light, as well as the Church and the Bible, all claimed for themselves an authoritative hearing within the Church of England; and each, when overstressed, had led to the formation of Nonconformist sects outside her fellowship. But now, with men like Coleridge among the laity, and clergy so well-informed as a class that from them the British Association elected more than a quarter of its sub-committee members, the unsolved problems bid fair to reach a right solution. At this point, however, the rise of the Tractarians, who deliberately repudiated the movements of new thought, changed the situation. 'My battle,' wrote Newman in his *Apologia*, 'was with Liberalism; by Liberalism I mean the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments.' Thus, when the formulation of the theory of evolution provided a direct challenge to the Church to declare its mind,

the leading ecclesiastical authorities ranged themselves on the wrong side; but not the Church as a whole. The first clash of what was to prove a long-drawn battle took place at the meeting of the British Association in Oxford in 1860, a few months after the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. Leonard Huxley, in Chapter XIV of the life of his father, describes vividly the thrilling encounter between Bishop Wilberforce and Professor Huxley. For this encounter we read that the room was crowded.

> 'The clergy,' proceeds the biographer, 'who shouted lustily for the Bishop, were massed in the middle of the room; behind them, in the north-west corner, a knot of undergraduates (one of these was T. H. Green, who listened, but took no part in the cheering) had gathered together beside Professor Brodie, ready to lift their voices, poor minority though they were, for the opposite party. Close to them stood one of the few men among the audience already in Holy Orders, who joined in—and indeed led—the cheers for the Darwinians.'

We here do honour to that unknown Modernist clergyman and to the others who were with him. Their presence brings home once more the fact that, although the Church of England reverences the past, and, like all other English institutions, feels the duty of moderating change, nevertheless, because of her very history and spirit, the truth can always gain a victory from within her. Never has she spoken with one voice against new truth, and later, when the world has passed on to other issues, quietly incorporated it, professing that she has always believed it and that anyway it makes no difference. There have always been within the Church of England more than 'seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal.'

The evolutionary question was a particularly testing one, for it seemed to rob man himself of his spiritual nature; and exactly in proportion as theology had become Deistic the evolutionary view of man as an integral part of the developing universe seemed to dispense with the necessity for a God to create—still more to love and redeem—him. But the Modernists of that day, particularly the writers of *Essays and Reviews*, and such men as Maurice, Kingsley, Hare and Hort, reached a view of the universe as having proceeded from the Creative Spirit of God, and of man as the highest product that we know of that evolutionary Creative Force which is still proceeding. Properly understood, evolution, as Dr. Tennant has said, restores man to the place in the universe from which Copernicus dethroned him.

Thus it has come to pass that human nature must be thought of as the supreme revelation of the Divine, and that the ultimate authority in religion is the inspired human spirit or higher reason, which the Dean of St. Paul's calls 'the logic of the whole personality'—reason, conscience and emotion all acting together in a unity. The Bible is surely a manifestation of this spirit: so too is the voice of the Church throughout the ages. Accordingly this spirit interprets and reconciles them to each other, and the attitude taken up instinctively by the Reformers now becomes explicit and fully justifiable. Faced by the challenge of evolution, then, the Church of England now takes its stand upon the higher reason as the ultimate authority and the avenue of Divine revelation.

Any refusal to admit this conclusion, now that it has become obvious, partakes at once of the nature of a reversal to a more primitive religious type, throws us back to the pre-Reformation view of religion, is a denial of the evolution that has taken place in Christianity. Its result is to destroy the monistic, organically inclusive view of things which we have reached, and to plunge us into the old dualism of nature and supernature, of God on this side and the world on that. Man's whole nature is no longer thought of as spiritual. The religious side is separated from the rest. So separated, so cut off from the other voices of life and of experience, it becomes a rank wilderness which may invade the whole personality, breeding superstitions and fancies; as we see to-day by the growth of Romanism, by the spread of fanciful religious cults, and by the recrudescence of sacramental superstition within our own Church; since the human heart will not be denied, and the unseen world must needs be near it in one way or another. Or again, the effect may be different. The separation may be accepted and formulated, as when Loisy and the Continental Modernists tried to save both religion and intellect by differentiating the Jesus of history, Whom their reason discovered, from the Christ on Whom the Church had fixed their faith. In the same kind of crisis, Giordano Bruno long ago had asserted that, as a priest, he could believe what the Inquisition wanted, but that, as a philosopher, he must believe something else.

Confronted by this disquieting religious situation in its various aspects, is it any wonder that thousands of those in whom intellect predominates become sceptics and secularists? In their case it is intellect, or the passions, which invade the whole of life, so that in the end all life's sanctities are done away and men go naked. Nor are they any happier for it: they grow restless, impoverished of soul, unbalanced, self-centred. We remember the girl on the piano in Mr. Coward's 'Cavalcade,' who sings dully, among other things, about there being no God, and ends with the refrain, 'It's getting me down, it's getting me down'; or again, the concluding scene of Mr. Shaw's play, 'Too True to be Good,' where, as the mists descend, the hero cries, 'I have no Bible: I have no Creed. The War has shot both out of my hands . . . All I know is that I must find the way of life, for myself and all of us, or we shall surely perish.'

In the midst of such scenes as these, Modernists lift their heads joyfully. They say to the supernaturalist, 'Follow the truth, wherever it leads, for no truth can take us away from God, Who is Himself the Truth.' And to the secularist they say, 'You have sought truth, you have taken your freedom, heedless of religion: but now that the experiment has failed, join *us*, and see if what you crave is not to be found in the religion of Christ. Freedom and love are to be found in their perfection in the Christianity which Modernists attempt to preach, and no sacrifice is demanded by Modernism of your utter sincerity. No misgivings need haunt you that you will have to choose between the religion which Christ taught and the established findings of man's intellect or the promptings of your own heart in its moments of highest aspiration. The stern demands of holiness will discipline but not gall you, when your whole being acknowledges their claim. The emotional values that others may find in superstition you can find here in the reverence, the love and service that God in Christ will evoke: your model will be One Who also gives you aid to resemble Him; all men will be your brothers and in a thousand ways you will serve them, if you will but serve Him first, Who is never aloof nor with averted gaze, but is calling to you and speaking to you always through the whole of creation and of life.'

Freedom, Truth and Love are the characteristics of Christian redemption as understood and preached by Modernists. We have seen that they are also the fundamental characteristics and the only justification for the existence of the Church of England. The Church of England can — indeed must — consistently, whole-heartedly, admit Modernism as her own.

THE CHARACTER AND CALL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN RELATION TO THE STATE

By the Rev. Professor Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil.

'I CAN think of nothing so tending to debase the ideal of the State as to talk about "freeing the Church from the bondage of the State." This representation of the State as something inherently unholy, something stifling to spiritual aspiration, something from which the high-minded man longs to be delivered, is very dangerous teaching, and indeed is not seriously meant. But disestablishment—or, as I prefer to call it, the repudiation of a Christian basis of the State—would go far to give real vitality to such opinions. Deplorable as this result would be, I do not see on what grounds it could be deprecated by those who rashly raise so large an issue to gain such a trivial advantage. For it is a large issue which is raised when it is proposed that the English State should divest itself of its religious character.'[1] These words, addressed by Mandell Creighton in his Primary Charge to the diocese of Peterborough in 1894, and in rebuke of the first murmurings of the political agitation which culminated twenty years later in the Welsh Church Disestablishment Measure, strike upon our ears with an antique, almost anachronistic, accent. During the interval which separates the last decade of the Victorian age from the post-War period the rate of change has been so accelerated as to sweep away many of the landmarks of English society familiar to Creighton. Nor is the transformation of ideas more remarkable in any sphere of national life than in that of religion. 'Fifty and even forty years ago,' observed the Dean of the Arches, 'disestablishment and disendowment were demanded from outside. Nonconformists and the great organizations in which the most important of them, then as now, had been systematized, clamoured for a change. . . . The situation is now greatly changed. Disestablishment is still claimed by the great Nonconformist bodies, but only languidly. Even the Liberation Society is in a poor way. Disendowment, since

[1] M. Creighton: *The Church and the Nation*, p. 34.

the War, has lost a good deal of its popularity. For some reason or other, the tendency to give rather than to deprive has grown. . . . But the recent demand for a rearrangement, or for a disconnection, of the relations of Church and State has come from the inside. It has seemed shocking to an increasing body who are now called Anglo-Catholics, and not only to them but also to many loyal Churchmen who are not Anglo-Catholics, that the Church should be hampered in the composition of its prayers and the arrangement of its public worship by an assembly like the House of Commons, containing many who are Christians but not Churchmen and some who are neither.'[2] Of the significance of this metamorphosis it is impossible to be unaware. The agitation for disestablishment is now assuredly 'seriously meant'; it is predominantly ecclesiastical as distinct from political in provenance, and clerical rather than lay in character. Even if something be discounted from the clamorous anti-climax of the chameleon episcopate of the Bishop of Durham, in his demand in season and out of season, here a little, there a little, line upon line, for immediate disestablishment, yet a sufficient significance remains in the fact that so many and varied voices are raised in support of his thesis. The events of 1927-8, when the House of Commons twice rejected the Revised Prayer Book, have produced a situation of admitted delicacy and potential gravity; and the solution of the difficulty thus created may only be sought by a wide survey of all aspects of the position. If we reject the proposed remedy of disestablishment as undesirable, we may not do so without allowing the pressure of practical difficulties and the admitted tension of some features of the present situation.

The considered pronouncements of Mandell Creighton are nowhere more worthy of study and pondering than in this battlefield of the relations of Church and State; for he brought to his brief episcopate gifts of statesmanship based upon a profound knowledge of the history of the English Church, especially detailed in the Reformation epoch, and an almost unparalleled understanding of and sympathy with its *ethos*. Thereby he was enabled in singular degree to penetrate beneath the disputes of the moment and to perceive the more far-reaching implications of popular short-cuts to their resolution. 'That an ancient nation

[2] L. T. Dibdin: *Establishment in England*, pp. 1, 2.

like England should deliberately repudiate any organic connection between the basis of its national life and the profession of the Christian Faith seems to me a calamity which could never be repaired.'[3] It will be observed that Creighton speaks of the English *nation*; and the choice of word is important, for, as he insisted in this connection, behind the terms of Church and State there lies the nation; and 'the nation means the people as a whole, with all their desires and aspirations, and by reference to their capacity for developing and expressing these desires and aspirations, the institutions both of Church and State may fairly be judged.'[4] The fundamental question remains, therefore, as to whether it is any longer to be desired that the English people should preserve an organic relation between its national life and the profession of Christianity. Of the continued importance of the nation as the unit of political organization little doubt may be entertained in the present conditions of European civilization; and the alternative in England is, not the expansion of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* into the *Ecclesia Anglorum* becoming the Church of all the British peoples scattered throughout the world, and peradventure the substantive nucleus of an Universal Church embracing all non-Roman Christians, by the simple disavowal of the bonds which associate the two Provinces of Canterbury and York with the State in England; but the formal admission of the secularization of the English State and the reduction of the Church of England to the position of a free episcopal communion absorbed in the struggle for financial solvency and with impaired resources in buildings and personnel.

Nor does the plea for the continued national recognition of Christianity imply the obsolete Tudor theory of the identification of citizenship with Churchmanship. Since the Toleration Act of 1689, formal recognition has been accorded by the law to the principle of organized and corporate dissent from the Established Church, a concession tardily followed by the grant of complete civil equality to all persons outside the communion of that Church. The problem of the Disestablishment of the Church of England involves the vital question of the secularization of the State and its professed unconcern with the indoctrination of its people with the principles of Christianity in accordance with

[3] M. Creighton: *The Church and the Nation*, p. 31. [4] *Ibid*, p. 26.

any version, Protestant or Catholic. The issue at stake is not whether the majority of the citizens *are* Churchmen, but whether the State desires that they should ideally be Christian. It is evident that many of the leading political philosophers of this generation would answer such a query with an emphatic negative, and would maintain that from the standpoint of the State it is a matter of indifference whether the nation in its families and individual units professes any allegiance to religion in any wise. The interest of the State is that they should be loyal, patriotic subjects of the existing form of political society : that they should obey the laws and eschew such practices as are inimical to the preservation of social solidarity : and that education should be directed solely to vocational and secular ends. To argue against this standpoint is not germane to this present paper, nor to the immediate situation; for the demand for disestablishment proceeds chiefly from Churchmen, and it is the Churchmen whom one would desire to convince, in the words of Creighton, of the unwisdom of 'raising so large an issue to gain such a trivial advantage.' Notwithstanding, it may be permissible to point in passing to a recent example of the importance of religion in national life, in the development of the British Broadcasting Corporation. According to the secular theory of the State, it may be supposed that religious issues should be excluded from its programmes, or at least that regular religious services and exhortations should not be broadcast. Yet the religious policy of the B.B.C. has supplied perhaps the strongest testimony of recent years to the very ideal for which Establishment stands, that of the concern of the State for religion. From the standpoint of the State the preservation of the establishment of the Church of England represents the English ideal that political life is not antagonistic to, nor divorced from, the principles of religion; and that the State is neither purely secular nor atheistic. If it be objected that this is merely to continue an external form whereof the reality is nigh unto vanishing away, the answer may still be made in the form of the question whether it is desirable to arrest the process of dissociation or set it forward. Amid the steady expansion of the beneficent activities of the modern State, which embrace so essentially spiritual an office as the national provision of primary and secondary education, it is undesirable that

the formal profession of purely secular aims should be made; and to this end the maintenance of the Establishment is justified from the standpoint of the State. For though the State may no longer require its citizens to be likewise Churchmen, nor even professed adherents of any religious society, it does not follow that Christianity is antagonistic to citizenship, nor that the nation should disavow all desire for the organic recognition of its Christian character. 'Weigh these things in themselves,' observed Hooker of the exterior symbols of social life; 'titles, gestures, presents, other the like external signs wherein honour doth consist, and they are matters of no great moment. Howbeit, take them away, let them cease to be required, and they are not things of small importance which that surcease were likely to draw after them.' [5]

II.

It is, however, from the standpoint of professed Churchmen that the chief difficulties of the situation of a National Church are proclaimed at this juncture. Nor may it be denied that the acceptance of this status does imply certain characteristics and impose certain restrictions upon the ecclesiastical society.

> 'The idea of a Church, universal in organization, has been tried, and as a matter of fact has failed because it could not make room for two forces which have been most powerful in shaping the modern world — the forces of nationality and liberty. These forces have their defects, like all else, and need discipline from that spiritual truth which it is the duty of the Church to teach.'

But in assisting the spiritual development of peoples, Creighton insisted on the greater service rendered by a national as compared with an universal Church:

> 'A Church which claims universal obedience, uses force when it can command it, and intrigue when it cannot. It takes up a position of lofty superiority to the State, and asserts an independence which it does not in fact possess. Its claims read well on paper; it makes beautiful provision for a good time which never comes. A National Church can put forward no such far-reaching pretensions, nor issue such peremptory commands, which are attractive in the eyes of bystanders who covet power — and who does not? — until they perceive that those commands are rarely obeyed. A National Church stands in close relation to the life of a particular nation, and tries to lead it to a recognition of its eternal destiny, not to force it into a common mould. It persuades rather than commands; its weapon is influence, not power.' [6]

[5] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, VII, xvii, 4.

[6] M. Creighton: *The Idea of a National Church*: *op. cit.*, pp. 214, 215

In the abstract, there is little occasion for depreciation of the National as contrasted with the Universal Church as known to history. It remains to consider wherein, in practical conditions of association, the State has trespassed upon the province and violated the essential freedom of the English Church. Chief amongst these trespasses, the English method of appointing to bishoprics is alleged as scandalous.

> 'It is not only that bishops are selected by a system which is sharply at variance with the Catholic conception of sacramental endowment and spiritual authority,' declared the Principal of Chichester Theological College upon a recent occasion; 'it is that by the very nature of the political relation which that system implies, they are irrevocably hampered in a hundred ways. It is impossible for the clergy or laity of the Church to feel that they are really represented by men in whose appointment they have had no voice, or for the average uninstructed English citizen to think of such men as Spiritual Fathers, and not as a particular class of Government officials.' [7]

The strict application of these criteria, indeed, would bring the vast majority of the English episcopate of the pre-Reformation epoch under the reproach of being appointed by a method 'sharply at variance with the Catholic conception of sacramental endowment and spiritual authority'; for no English sovereign of the Middle Ages surrendered this prerogative to cathedral chapters, but in general Pope and King shared the episcopal appointments of the realm. Nor have even modern Roman Catholic peoples escaped this uncatholic affliction of the English Church. During the long period of French history from the Concordat between the Papacy and Napoleon I to the separation of Church and State in 1905, the process of nomination to sees was more summary and the choice of the Government less restricted than in England; yet the abrogation of this concordat was regarded by the Papacy as a cruel wrong to the Roman Church. Under the traditional Austrian Hapsburg monarchy the Crown's power of selection was as complete as in England; whilst even with non-monarchical States such as the Chilean Republic the Papacy made a concordat by which the Senate possessed the rights of initial nomination of a number of candidates and of final approval (and therefore rejection) of the person chosen from their list by the Papacy. How many generations of Austrian and French Roman Catholic clergy, and even of their brethren across the Atlantic, have acquiesced in con-

[7] *The Church Times*: p. 95, col. ii. July 21, 1933.

cordats negotiated by Rome itself in such manner as to violate 'the Catholic conception of sacramental endowment and spiritual authority'; and how many of the faithful but uninstructed laity have felt themselves unrepresented by men in whose appointment they have had no voice and whom they have been unable, therefore, to regard as Spiritual Fathers!

In point of fact, however, the Catholic conception of sacramental endowment and spiritual authority derives from the ecclesiastical rite of consecration (preceded by confirmation), and not from any particular method of nomination. It is generally forgotten that an English Nonconformist Prime Minister stands in the same relation to episcopal nominations as did his French counterpart in the days of the French Republic before the law of Separation. His choice is restricted to persons upon whom the Episcopate of the Church, acting without any intermixture of secular authority, has conferred the orders of deacon and priest, and thereby approved as ministers and teachers in the Church. He may not appoint Methodist, Presbyterian, nor Congregational ministers, nor even Anglican laity, to the Bench. Further, there rests with the Archbishop the authority of confirmation and the responsibility of consecration; the reality of which was emphasized by Archbishop Davidson in the case of the election of Dr. Henson to the see of Hereford, though that prelate may not now desire to be reminded of the grace of the Establishment whereby a priest was nominated to a see despite vociferous clerical and even episcopal protest! No presbyter may be raised to the episcopate without the full concurrence of the ecclesiastical authority represented by the Archbishop and two other bishops who act as consecrators. Nor is the English system without evident practical advantages. It does secure a nomination, and avoids such unseemly squabbles as have been recently enacted in Australia, and the protracted vacancy of sees owing to the inability of electoral boards to obtain a sufficient majority often witnessed in the American Episcopal Church. The real objection to the method lies in the fact that official representation of an ecclesiastical party on the Bench often lags far behind its influence amongst the clergy of the dioceses. But the past history of the English Church certainly suggests a doubt whether the unfettered action of the episcopate would

have suffered new movements to gain a foothold even in the parishes, much less a representation on the Bench.

The fundamental issue lies in the circumstance of the diversity of party tradition and theological opinion within the Church of England, and the consequent tension which this produces. The chief features of English Church History since the Reformation have centred round the successive religious movements whereby each theological school in turn — Calvinist, Laudian, Puritan, Caroline, Latitudinarian, Evangelical and Tractarian — has contended for the pre-eminence. Beneath the variety of names by which the revivals have been known, the Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal elements have acted and re-acted upon each other within the accepted framework of the Anglican constitution. Their co-existence has been due largely to the circumstances that the Elizabethan Religious Settlement was the work of *politiques*, not of religious zealots, and that the English Prayer Book and Articles were intended to be patient of a wide latitude of interpretation. Naturally and inevitably each successive school in the period of its predominance has endeavoured to stretch the bonds of interpretation in its own favour and to narrow them in regard to its rivals; and this attempt has assumed the form of recurrent projects for Prayer Book Revision, whether those of the Puritans of Elizabeth's reign, or the Scottish Revision sponsored by Laud, or the English Revision which received statutory enforcement in 1662, or the Non-Juror Liturgy or the Latitudinarian projects associated with the name of Dr. Samuel Clarke. Historically it has fallen to the lot of Parliament to maintain the comprehension established at the Reformation. But with the removal of all restrictions and religious tests upon membership of Parliament, and with the increasing volume of business of State brought upon nineteenth-century Parliaments, the need for some practical *modus operandi* whereby the passage of ecclesiastical legislation through the two Houses could be facilitated was realized, and an attempt to achieve this working compromise was made by the Enabling Act of 1919. Theoretically the provisions of that measure seemed to provide a workable solution: for whilst endowing the Church Assembly with powers of deliberation, debate and presentation of projects of ecclesiastical legislation, it reserved to Parliament the right

of final veto on measures so presented. It should be observed that in accepting the Enabling Bill, Parliament consented to a wide delegation of its powers; it surrendered the right of alteration or modification of measures sent forward from the Church Assembly; it abandoned the right to initiate ecclesiastical legislation (save on such questions as tithe, for example); and it accepted the limited right of final veto. Such a concession argued a generous readiness to assist the self-government of the Church. Nor has the practical operation of the Act been generally unsatisfactory: out of a total of forty-four measures only three have been rejected in the House of Commons and one in the Lords (the last largely by the eloquence of the Bishop of Durham during his episcopate of Hereford, who appealed successfully from the vote of the Church Assembly to that of Parliament on the Shropshire Bishopric Bill). But of the Bills defeated in the Commons the Prayer Book Revision of 1927-8 was a crucial test of the adequacy of the solution proposed by the Enabling Act.

Of the critical nature of this issue no doubt may be entertained. Nor should I disguise my personal regret that the Lower Parliamentary House did not elect to follow the lead of the Upper by accepting the Revised Book of 1927. But, whilst granting full weight to the serious constitutional situation created by the action of the Commons, the question may still be asked whether the crisis is of such gravity as to demand disestablishment, and whether that remedy would in fact be proper and efficacious to the affliction. Dr. Figgis and Bishop Creighton unite in bidding us to enquire more closely into the meaning of the phrase—a conflict between Church and State. 'When the liberty of the Church is claimed, it almost always denotes the liberty of the heirarchy, not that of the whole body,'[8] observed the former; whilst the latter conjured us to remember that 'what are called collisions between Church and State would be more accurately described as collisions between Churchmen and Statesmen.'[9] It may be that the difficulties of 1927-8 were of the character thus delineated. This interpretation does not in the leastwise diminish the seriousness of the collision. Upon the preparation of the

[8] J. N. Figgis: *Churches in the Modern State*, p. 78.
[9] M. Creighton: *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

Revised Prayer Books of 1927-8 much labour and thought had been expended; the reception accorded especially to the Revision of 1927 in ecclesiastical circles seemed to promise a widespread acceptance of the Book as a *pactum unionis* among the differing schools of thought; and the double rejection did go far to paralyse episcopal administration and the attempt to secure an agreed standard of conformity. I hope that this standpoint will be accepted : for no suggestion may be entertained of episcopal attempts to narrow the comprehensiveness of the Church by refusal of the legitimate representation of Anglo-Catholicism. I am bound to regret, therefore, the action of the Commons in 1927-8 in adding to the difficulties of administration and creating an almost insoluble problem for the episcopate. But to make this admission does not imply advocacy of a change in the present conditions of establishment, for it is ill-policy to destroy the national character of the Church to relieve a temporary embarrassment of the episcopate. It is possible further to contend that episcopal policy after the first rejection in December, 1927, was ill-advised in not re-presenting to Parliament a Revision which omitted the new Communion Office and the provisions for Reservation. It is probable that the remainder of the Book would have been carried, and thereby the most valuable portions from the standpoint of parochial use been fully authorized. Further, it was upon the question of the Communion Office and Reservation that opinion amongst professed Churchmen was most sharply divided, opposition being found in advanced Anglo-Catholic no less than in Evangelical circles; and, with these hostile criticisms receiving expression during the Parliamentary debates, the verdict of the House of Commons in effect amounted to a suspensory veto and a withholding of approval until the Church parties themselves should have attained a greater degree of agreement. If this interpretation be allowed, the duty of toleration and of eirenic comprehension is laid primarily upon the Churchmen; for it can hardly be doubted that in the differences between Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic within the Church lay the real cause of the Revision *débâcle*. Such a division of the projected Revision would have deferred the enactment of an alternative Communion Office until a more distant future, whilst the ordinary administrative action of the epis-

copate could have regulated Reservation pending an agreed solution of this vexed question. If it be granted that the limits of loyalty to the Anglican tradition should be determined henceforth, not by legal prosecution to determine the bounds of some particular rubrical phraseology, but by the endeavour towards the development of an agreed standard of conformity, then a good deal may be said for the vesting of a reasonable and wide latitude in episcopal administration. By this means statutory authorization might have been secured for the revised services of Morning and Evening Prayer and the Occasional Offices, and the constitutional issue of a conflict between the Church Assembly and the Parliament would not have been raised as a matter of public debate. Thereby the real difficulties of the rebuff of 1927-8 might have been overcome in practice, if not in theory; and it is characteristic of the English genius to be little disposed to demand strict logic if a working compromise can be achieved.

III.

Herein lies the fundamental weakness of the champions of disestablishment. 'In pursuing its course,' observed Creighton, 'the Church of England has to endure much from human wilfulness—but not more than the Church of Rome. It is only deprived of the privilege of sulking, which it knows to be useless. This privilege, however, seems to have an attraction to some, who when they do not immediately get their own way exclaim, "Better disestablishment than this"; as if in any change in organization it was quite certain that their own particular opinions would prevail.'[10] Not a little of the present agitation for disestablishment is couched unfortunately in terms suggestive of petulance; but, disallowing infelicities of expression and giving full weight to the admitted gravity of the situation arising from the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book, it may be doubted whether disestablishment would not make the situation worse rather than better. There is a general consensus of opinion both amongst historical students and ecclesiastical statesmen that the peculiar conditions of the English establishment are due to the development of the supremacy of Parliament over all rival jurisdictions in England. The supremacy of the State over the

[10] M. Creighton: *Op. cit.*, p. 215.

Church, conceived by the Tudor monarchs as royal, not parliamentary, was converted during the seventeenth century into a definitely parliamentary supremacy. Thus the possibility of the Convocations transacting ecclesiastical business and legislating by canon upon ecclesiastical matters, subject only to the consent of the Crown and without the necessary confirmation of the Parliament, was frustrated, and the victory of the lay lawyers was rendered complete. This victory of the Parliament over its competitors, which is the differentia of English constitutional history, is the obvious obstacle to the domestication in Anglican ecclesiastical affairs of a scheme fashioned after the Scottish model; but from this very circumstance there ensues also the prime difficulty of proposals for disestablishment. 'So long as this doctrine or anything like it be dominant,' wrote Figgis of the theory of the omnipotence of Parliament, 'it would probably be an evil rather than a benefit if the Church of England were to become what it now is not, a corporation recognized as such by the law. For that would under existing conditions mean that it was subject to all sorts of restrictions, while at the same time it would still be denied inherent rights of self-development.'[11] That is to say, the determination of the conditions of disestablishment would be the task of that very Parliament whose rejection of the Deposited Book is denounced as a violation of the spiritual autonomy of the Church. Nor would its power be restricted to questions of finance, such as the degree of disendowment, or of property, such as the trusteeship of cathedrals and parish churches (though even here it is well to remember that the secularization of all cathedrals and some parish churches is conceivable); the authority of Parliament would determine the form of liturgy and the articles of subscription by which the Church would continue to hold property, and to which legal appeal would be made in future ecclesiastical controversies. The disestablished Church might enter into its inheritance of freedom not only maimed in personnel, finance and buildings, but deprived of no inconsiderable measure of that latitude and comprehensiveness which is still its prerogative. The experiment of disestablishment might not inconceivably evoke an unexpected zeal for religion in the Parliament which might have an unhappy

[11] J. N. Figgis: *Churches in the Modern State*, pp. 65, 66.

influence upon the constitution and charter of disestablishment. Certainly it is far from assured that the venture would be advantageous to the Church even from the standpoint of religious and theological freedom and catholicity. The Bishop of Durham has testified recently to the extreme solicitude of the State for its partner during the interval since the Prayer Book rejection, and has even spoken of gilded fetters. Nor does his insistence upon the necessity of disestablishment, despite these alleviations, rest unqualified by the fact that, unlike the Independents or the Non-Jurors of an earlier century, the intolerable pressure of servitude has happily not disenabled him from continuing to discharge the office and work of a State-appointed bishop amongst us, nor driven him into the solitude of an unfruitful secession!

In conclusion, it may be proper to turn from the negative aspect of the relations of Church and State to consider the positive call and character of the Church of England in relation to the State. The maintenance of the Establishment symbolizes the recognition of Christian profession by the nation, and though the Church may not enter into political conflicts, it may assuredly fulfil its stewardship as keeper of the national conscience by such measures as its cordial support of the Government's campaign for the abolition of slums, and other similar progressive schemes of social amelioration, notably in the field of education. In the sphere of religion more narrowly conceived, a National Church must needs be comprehensive and broadly based. The preservation of its tradition of diversity of theological and ceremonial expression is indeed the most vital task of the English Church to-day, together with the correlated work of achieving an essential unity amidst differences of emphasis and expression. Catholic it must needs be as the inheritor of the medieval heritage preserved to it despite the changes of the Reformation, yet interpreting its catholicity by the spirit of liberalism and the critical studies of theological and historical scholarship; and evangelical as a Church Reformed and appealing to the authority of Holy Scripture but as expounded by critical Biblical exploration. The Church of England should be neither an imitation of Rome nor an undifferentiated version of Geneva or Independency; rather it should fulfil its historic endeavour 'to tread the

mean betwixt extremes.' Bereft of any of its three schools of Churchmanship—Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal—it would forfeit its claim to be even ideally the *Ecclesia Anglorum*.

> 'For myself,' wrote Creighton, '—shall I venture to confess it?—I have an ideal of the Church of England which has steadily grown with my growth. I see in it a Church, not existing in indefinite space and founding claims to universality on the ground that it has no particular home, but a Church rooted in the minds and hearts of the English people. I am not ashamed to say that as I look round the world, I see no other home so well suited for a divine institution. From that home it can go forth courageously and face the world as it is, believing that God's revelation of Himself, once made in the person of Jesus Christ, is being continually explained to man by the progressive revelation of God's purpose which is being continually made by the divine government of the world. Stedfast in its hold on the Faith and on the Sacraments by its unbroken link with the past, it exists for the maintenance of God's truth and its application to the needs of man, and not for the purpose of upholding its own power. A Church fitted for free men, training them in knowledge and reverence alike; disentangling the spirit from the form, because of its close contact with sons who love their mother and frankly speak out their minds; not wandering among formulae, however beautiful, which have lost their meaning; finding room increasingly for every form of devotional life, but training its graces into close connection with men's endeavours and aspirations; having no objects of its own which it cannot explain and make manifest as being for the highest good of all; afraid of nothing; receptive of new impulses; quick, watchful, alert; proving all things and ever ready to give a reason for its principles and for their application; exhorting, persuading, convincing; so rooted in the past that it is strong in the present and evermore hopeful of the future. For the great work of the Church of Christ is to mould the future and so hasten the coming of the Kingdom of God. Its eyes are turned to the past for instruction and warning, not for imitation . . . Is this only a dream, to be realized — for realized it assuredly must be — at some future time and under some other name? Or shall we enter upon the possession which is really ours, did we but know it? Our difficulties and differences arise because we have not a sufficiently lofty conception of the destiny of the English Church. If any disaster befall it, the record that will be written hereafter will be that English Churchmen of this day were not sufficiently large-hearted and high-minded to recognize the greatness of the heritage which was theirs.' [12]

Such is the call and character of the Church of England: allied with the humanistic spirit in literature, art and music; alert to the critical movements of Biblical and historical scholarship; responsive to all demands for social justice and valiant in support of all schemes of national amelioration; thereby it may become that Catholic Church of the English people to which Thomas Hardy looked with sympathetic and wistful longing as the Divine Society enabled to garner the heritage of the past and mould the religious tradition of the future.

[12] M. Creighton: *Op. cit.*, pp. 284, 285.